DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 173 UD 009 132

By-Hood, Paul D.; Johnson, James N.

The Development and Evaluation of a Television Workshop in Human Relations.

Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, Berkeley, Calif.

Pub Date Apr 69

Note-119p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.05

Descriptors-Discussion Groups, *Educational Television, *Human Relations, Leaders Guides, *Pilot Projects, Program Descriptions, Program Development, Program Evaluation, Role Playing, School Personnel, *Teacher Workshops, Urban Schools, Video Tape Recordings

Identifiers-California, Far West Laboratory Educational Research Develop, KQED, Oakland, San Francisco, University of California

A television workshop in human relations for teachers and other school staff was developed as a cooperative project involving the San Francisco and Oakland, California public schools, a unit of the University of California, the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, and KQED, the area's educational television station. This pilot project used the technique of audiovisual dramatizations of human relations problems relevant to these inner city schools. Group discussion or role playing followed the viewing of each film program. The report describes the development of the videotapes, the five programs, the discussion leaders and viewers guides, and various other components. One section presents an evaluation of the workshop in terms of context, input, process, and product. The results of this performance field test point to the utility and value of the programs which will be revised and improved on the basis of information collected from the evaluations. (NH)

ED033173

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A TELEVISION WORKSHOP IN HUMAN RELATIONS

A REPORT PREPARED BY

Paul D. Hood

James N. Johnson

April, 1969

Produced By
FAR WEST LABORATORY FOR EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1 Garden Circle, Hotel Claremont
Berkeley, California 94705

UD 009 132

PREFACE

This report describes the initial development of an educational product that was specifically designed to stimulate discussion and examination of human relations problems encountered in the secondary schools of the "core cities."

This development was undertaken by a consortium composed of the San Francisco and Oakland Public Schools, the University of California, Berkeley Education Extension, and the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, in cooperation with KQED Bay Area Educational Television Association.

The report describes the establishment of the Consortium, the development and evaluation of the workshop prototypes, and the production, field use and evaluation of the Human Relations Workshop "package." This package, which was initially developed under the technical supervision of the Communication Program of the Laboratory, has been transferred to the Teacher Education Program where it will be revised and improved to include discussion leader training components, and then again evaluated under operational field test conditions prior to eventual release for school use.

It is hoped that the information in this report will prove useful, both to those interested in the content and evaluation of this specific educational product and to those who may profit from the description of the development process.

I wish to make special acknowledgment to Staten W. Webster, the Consortium Project Director, who, along with James N. Johnson, assumed the major burden for development and production. John J. Carusone, Coordinator, Human Relations and Volunteers, Oakland City Unified School District; William L. Cobb, Human Relations Officer, San Francisco Unified School District; and James E. Jensen, Head, Education Extension, University of California, Berkeley, devoted many hours to the organization and successful execution of the Consortium activities. Grandvel A. Jackson of the San Francisco Human Relations Office, and Irma Jones and Mary Frances Everhart of the Oakland Human Relations Office served in many advisory and liaison capacities. Special acknowledgment is due Joanne M. Mock, Producer-Director KQED Instructional Television, who assumed major responsibility for the KQED contribution. We acknowledge the assistance of Fannie R. Shaftel of Stanford University for her help in the discussion-leader training. We thank Susan Perry, Richard Watkins, David Carlisle and Smithie Henry who assisted project staff as interviewers or observers of the school discussions. Thanks are also due Sylvia Obradovic and Ben Yerger of the Laboratory staff who interviewed community members for Program 1. Susan Ker of the University of California Education Extension, and Shereeliz Lamb, Virginia Diquattro, and Alice Moses of the Laboratory deserve special thanks for their many secretarial, clerical and support talents.

PAUL D. HOOD
Director
Communication Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE CONSORTIUM PLAN.. 1
    The Establishment of the Bay Area T.V. Consortium............ 1
    Plan of Development... 4
        Rationale... 4
        Approach.. 4
        Implementation.. 6
        Evaluation.. 6
II. DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOTYPES....................................... 8
    Data-Gathering.. 8
    Program Content... 8
    Production of Prototypes.................................... 9
    Evaluation of Prototypes.................................... 10
III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORKSHOP PACKAGE............................ 12
    Production of Broadcast T.V. Programs....................... 12
    Film Production, Problems and Their Impact on Programs 1 and 2.. 12
    Development of Other Package Components..................... 13
IV. CONDUCT OF LEADER TRAINING SESSIONS............................. 15
V. THE SCHOOL DISCUSSION SESSIONS................................... 17
VI. EVALUATION.. 19
    Context Evaluation.. 19
        The critical-incidents survey........................... 20
        The pre-series sampling survey.......................... 21

Table of Contents (Cont'd.)

Input Evaluation 24

Process Evaluation 29

Observer reports 30

Critique form 32

Immediate use of process information 35

Later use of process information 36

Product Evaluation 36

Summary of End-of-Course Evaluations Made by Participants 41

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS 45

Recommendations 45

Conclusions 49

APPENDICES

A. A Summary of Problem Areas Identified Via Critical-Incidents Interviews 50

B. Pre-Series Sampling Survey of School Staff Perceptions, Attitudes, and Opinions 57

C. Observer Reports 77

D. Program Critique Forms 82

E. Content Analysis of the End-of-Course Questionnaire 93

PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY 113

LIST OF TABLES

1. Percentages for Responses to Program Critique Forms.................. 33
2. Content Analysis of Reported Human Relations Problems............... 58
3. Type of Action Being Taken in Reported Human Relations Problems..... 60
4. Items Used in the Two Incomplete-Sentence Forms..................... 63
5. Observer Reports.. 81

I. THE CONSORTIUM PLAN

The Establishment of the Bay Area TV Consortium

Early in January, 1968, the superintendents of the San Francisco and Oakland Public Schools were seeking the use of inservice television programs to ease a general school climate of racial tension and possible class disruption. The University of California Education Extension was willing to experiment in, and had funds to contribute to, an educational television course. The Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development was approached because of its developmental capabilities and experience in educational television. On January 10, 1968, a meeting was held, consisting of representatives of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco Unified School District, Oakland Unified School District, University of California Education Extension, and KQED Bay Area Educational Television Association, to explore the idea of making a series of programs designed to reduce attitudinal and communication barriers among school personnel, community, and students--especially minority groups in the core cities.

Out of this and subsequent meetings, a TV Consortium was formed consisting of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco Unified School District, Oakland Unified School District, and the Education Extension of the University of California, Berkeley, California. Members agreed to produce, in cooperation with KQED Bay Area Educational Television Association, five one-half hour television programs depicting encounters between students, parents, and school personnel designed to create teachers' awareness of attitudes and habits that alienate and impair effective communicatio

After careful consideration, several preliminary decisions were made:

1. To limit content area to secondary schools because the need seemed more immediate at this level, and because spreading our effort across the problems of both elementary and secondary schools might have attenuated its effectiveness.
2. To limit this first effort to a teacher and other school staff audience; subsequent programs might work with students, parents, or administrators.
3. Because of the urgency expressed by the superintendents and their concern with the psychological effect of presenting their teachers with this program at the beginning of the school year, the Consortium agreed, despite the serious time limitations this imposed, to complete the series by September, 1968, and air the first program October 2, 1968. It was agreed that the format of the workshop would consist of a one-half hour telecast shown to teachers in their schools, intended as a stimulus, and that this would be followed by small discussion groups led by trained leaders, in which discussion, exercises, and role-playing would be utilized to help teachers locate undesirable feelings, attitudes, and practices, and to explore ways of improving them.

The Laboratory saw the workshop as both a means of assisting the schools and of improving its knowledge of television as an educational communication medium. Such an effort, entirely consistent with the Laboratory's development orientation, would involve a product with behavioral specifications, a developmental cycle of preliminary testing, revision, and main field-test evaluation; and it required active audience participation. The Laboratory agreed to provide funds in the amount of $25,000 and staff personnel to do research, produce the prototype programs, produce supplementary materials, and assist in the evaluation of the project.

The Oakland and San Francisco Unified School Districts agreed to provide program talent as well as necessary consulting services for program preparation. In addition, the schools agreed to recruit and provide school personnel for pretesting the series and to provide inservice education for instructors or group leaders from each viewing school. The internal publicity for this series was also their responsibility. The human relations offices of the two districts assumed responsibility for coordination within the school districts.

Education Extension, University of California, Berkeley, provided publicity in their catalog as well as an announcement sent to each teacher in the two school systems. In addition, Education Extension made arrangements to accredit the course and agreed to recruit and pay honorariums to the instructors as well as the panelists. Education Extension also provided additonal funds in the amount of $15,000 toward the project budget.

KQED Bay Area Educational Television Association, under contract to the Laboratory as the Consortium's agent, agreed to provide technical program direction and the necessary equipment and supplies for the production of the TV broadcast programs and to provide the air time. Each party agreed to assume responsibility for its own transportation, communication, printing, reproduction, and supply costs.

Overall direction of the Consortium was assumed by a board of directors consisting of one representative from the Laboratory, Education Extension, and the two school districts. A project director, an advisory committee composed of two people from each Consortium member, and a representative from KQED were responsible for selection and review of content and for the implementation of the program series in the schools.

From a list of names submitted by qualified people, Dr. Staten W. Webster was selected as Project Director. Responsibility for devising and producing the workshop devolved upon him and key Laboratory staff.

Plan of Development

Rationale. Audiovisual dramatizations of human relations problems followed by group discussion or role-playing has proved to be an effective technique which has been extensively employed in a variety of training situations. Perhaps the most thoroughly developed and evaluated example of the application of this technique is to be found in the work of Lange and his associates (Lange, et al., 1956). There is, of course, an extensive literature regarding case discussions, role-playing, and psycho-drama (see Partial Bibliography). The Consortium decided to use these techniques to fashion a pilot series of programs designed specifically to cope with pressing human relations needs in the core city schools.

Approach. Specifically, it was proposed to develop, through consultation with human relations personnel and other staff members of the Oakland and San Francisco school systems, as well as with other scholars and practitioners, a list of critical behavior patterns involving relations between school personnel and minority-group-students. The criteria for selecting each behavior were (a) it should be of major importance in the opinion of school personnel and (b) it should be amenable to behavioral or attitudinal modification.

From this list, a subset of problems would be selected for treatment in the course of five two-hour instructional sessions, each consisting of a brief orientation, thirty minutes of audiovisual presentations via ITV or film, and an ensuing period of discussion and learning exercises.

The plan called for development of a comprehensive "human-relations package" consisting of at least the following items:

1. A discussion leader's guide providing orientation, background information, general and specific directions for the conduct of each session, advice and recommendations for managing the organization and development of the group and for handling problems which might arise.
2. A set of five videotapes or films suitable for broadcast over instructional television stations or projection with motion picture equipment.
3. A set of evaluation devices including: (a) questionnaires/tests for participating teachers, appropriate for grading to obtain class credit as well as evaluation of the package; and (b) pre-session, post-session, and follow-up evaluation devices for overall evaluation of changes in knowledge, opinion, attitude, behavior, and unobtrusive indicators.
4. A set of orientation and publicity materials suitable for informing administrative, supervisory, and instructional personnel regarding the existence, purposes, and nature of the course.
5. A set of supporting materials suitable for assisting schools in the selection, orientation, and training of discussion leaders.

It was planned that items 1, 2, and 3 would be carried through at least one development cycle, including: (a) specification of measurable objectives; (b) selection of provisional content and technique; (c) evaluation of the materials with a small sample of representative school personnel; (d) revision of the content and format on the basis of the pretest evaluation; and (e) production of a revised item.

Implementation. The developed items would then be integrated in a package suitable for field testing. Following pretest evaluation of this package the Laboratory would undertake the training and support of discussion leaders selected from the schools.

The discussion leaders would be provided with a final version of the package and would be led through the steps of the program. A minimum of fourteen hours of training time would be required of each discussion leader since each of the five sessions would be reviewed in detail.

The discussion leaders' training sessions would be scheduled immediately before or after the opening of the fall term. Preferably the training sessions would be completed in two working days, or alternately, in seven two-hour sessions scheduled over a two-week interval.

Following the completion of the discussion leaders' training sessions, five discussion sessions would be scheduled in each school in conjunction with the TV broadcast time. Discussion leaders would have previously been provided with all necessary supporting materials.

Evaluation. Baseline data regarding behavior, attitude, opinion and knowledge in the selected topic areas would be collected prior to the series. All instruments and devices would be approved both by the Consortium Advisory

Committee and by the two school systems. In the evaluation, a variety of procedures were considered, including: interviews, questionnaires, attitude and opinion surveys, direct observation, and examination of records of incidents or events.

Discussion leaders would be requested to complete a short, post-session critique and evaluation report following each of the five sessions. A sample of discussion groups would be selected for observation.

Finally, each discussion participant would be requested to complete a post-session questionnaire/test which would be used both for project evaluation and for assigning grades for the extension course.

A tentative schedule of events, schedule of instruction, and a budget were developed.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF PROTOTYPES

Data-Gathering

The project staff searched relevant literature and examined the results of similar projects in human relations. Two staff members spent approximately three weeks in the San Francisco and Oakland secondary schools conducting both individual and small-group interviews with teachers, counselors, vice principals, and students (who ranged from "drop-outs" to student body presidents) in order to isolate human relations and racial problems that were recurring, significant, and reasonably subject to treatment by the projected television workshop. (For a sample of our findings, see Appendix A). This data-gathering was done in close cooperation with the Human Relations staffs of both districts. There was almost complete unanimity among the interviewees about the nature and content of critical behaviors.

Program Content

These data were translated by the project staff and the Advisory Committee into five program subjects, the rationale being to move from the more general and least threatening to the more specific and intense, as follows:*

Program 1. The school through the eyes of its clients, focusing those institutional practices that alienate community members.

Program 2. Curriculum and instructional practice, especially examining students' complaints that the classroom experience is often irrelevant and alienating.

Program 3. The use of undesirable language and stereotypes, especially terms and phrases having offensive ethnic, social, and personal implications.

---

*The Discussion Leader's Guide presents a fairly thorough account of these problem areas and our approach to them.

Program 4. An examination of the necessity and validity of rules and regulations and ways of handling them.

Program 5. Open-ended problem encounters between students and teachers, centering around racial, ethnic, social, and personal issues.

There were three reasons for the decision to begin with Program 5 and work backwards to Program 1:

1. From the point of view of refining technique, it would be better to start with the most difficult--the confrontation episodes.
2. KQED, for its own logistical reasons, preferred to record episodes before making complete programs.
3. Programs 1 and 2 required film, which required a longer preparation period as the Laboratory had no film maker and was working with videotape prototypes. Film required a different approach.

Production of Prototypes

The developmental strategy of the Laboratory was to first make a one-inch videotape, preliminary version of each program, test it, revise it, and then present the result to KQED as a model to guide their staff in producing the final version in a more finished form. Although time did not permit following this strategy to the letter (videotape models were not made for Programs 1 and 2), the procedure proved efficient. It enabled the Consortium to pre-test content and format, to acquire data for revision, and to help insure quality control at KQED, especially with regard to content. The KQED producer-director worked with the project staff at the Laboratory on prototypes 3 and 5, so that, before going to KQED, all were agreed upon style and content.

Method. The development procedure was refined as work progressed, but generally the steps were:

1. Write actor-script, get reactions, re-write.
2. Make story-board outline of each episode with positions, camera angles, etc.
3. Rehearse an episode with actors and dummy camera.
4. Tape it; redo as many times as necessary.
5. Make overall program script for narrator, camera, visuals, music.
6. Integrate into final version.

The first prototype was that of Program 4. It was initially tested with three groups brought to the Laboratory: Two were representative teachers; one was a critique panel consisting of teachers, principals, counselors and media people. All agreed the content was accurate and significant. A number of suggestions were made regarding treatment (a slower pace, more controlling narration, etc.) When the groups were in disagreement, the reactions of the teachers were given the greater weight in determining revision.

Evaluation of Prototypes

The prototypes for Programs 3, 4, and 5 were tested in this way. It proved very helpful for gauging the effect of the materials, but perhaps not so effective as if it had been possible to test the programs under actual school conditions, in which all the exigencies of time, viewing facilities, and teachers' resistance would come into play.

As a result of showing these prototypes to various groups, the members of the Consortium became concerned about extremist groups' reactions to the "controversial" nature of the content. Some expressed serious doubt whether the programs should be aired over public television. School administrators and black people, for instance, were concerned about the projected image of their respective groups. It was decided, therefore, to "tone down" some of the episodes and build a number of "disclaimers" into the narration. This was not done without costs since some teachers later complained that this weakened the effectiveness of the program.

III. DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORKSHOP PACKAGE

Production of Broadcast TV Programs

The method of production of the final programs at KQED involved review of the one-inch videotaped prototypes with preselected and proven actors, rehearsal, and shooting the episodes. On subsequent occasions, these episodes were knit together with narration, visuals, and music.

The advantages of this procedure were better sets and more professional production. But often what was gained in "polish" was accompanied by a loss in spontaneity and, to some extent, in control. Because of studio time costs, there was scant opportunity for retakes or for correcting something perceived from an educational point of view as an inadequacy or mistake. Many observers felt that the prototype materials were more spontaneous than the finished versions, probably because the endless waiting involved and little first-hand contact with the directors somewhat "flattened" the performance of the actors. But, on the whole, the effort worked successfully and according to plan.

Film Production Problems and Their Impact on Programs 1 and 2

These two programs were produced last and somewhat behind schedule. The broadcast deadlines created absolute limits with respect to the amount of time available for their development. Here, the production pressures, already very serious, were aggravated by the fact that three recommended film makers consecutively and for different reasons were at the last minute unable to undertake the work. Finally, the Consortium was left with no alternative but to hire a cameraman and shoot Program 1 with a minimum of pretested content.

The time available for production of Program 2, which was the last to be produced, posed even more serious problems. It is clear that this program was technically and substantively the weakest of all. Part of this weakness was attributed to the fact that the Laboratory staff was then at work on training sessions and the development of training materials, a situation which often required that the film maker did much of his editing without supervision from Laboratory staff.

Also, the subject of this program, curriculum relevancy and teaching method, proved clearly the most sensitive of all for teachers. Thus, the techniques successfully used for each of the other programs, calling attention to the problem by demonstrating it, backfired here when teachers became manifestly defensive and antagonistic. The observer reports indicate that Program 2 produced easily the most frustration and acrimony, and that, the following week, there was a certain tendency for Program 3 discussion groups to revert to this subject.

Development of Other Package Components

In addition to the five television programs, the project staff produced a number of auxiliary printed materials to aid the workshop discussion groups, each of which underwent its own revision cycle. They included the following items:

1. Discussion Leader's Guides were produced for each program. They presented the objectives and provided an analysis of each episode as well as specific information designed to assist the leader in exploring the issues.
2. Viewer's Guides presented a statement of the program objectives and a brief summary of program content. Space was provided for the viewer to enter comments and notes while he watched the program.
3. Exercise Sheets were assignment forms designed for distribution at

the conclusion of each of the first four programs. Each exercise sheet suggested some activity to be accomplished during the intervening week which would provide opportunity for thought about, or sensitization to, the problems to be presented during the next session.

4. Role-playing Forms were developed to assist the discussion leader in accomplishing role-playing exercises which might be undertaken in conjunction with the fourth and fifth programs. These forms contained brief descriptions of specific problem situations and role assignments.
5. Program Critique Forms, calling for brief evaluation of the TV program and ensuing discussion, were provided in quantity sufficient for all viewers to critique each of the five programs.

In addition to item 5 above, several evaluation instruments were developed, which are discussed in Section VI. U.C. Education Extension and the two school districts produced posters, course descriptions, and a number of publicity and administrative instruction items.

IV. CONDUCT OF LEADER-TRAINING SESSIONS

Selection and training of discussion leaders was considered to be crucial to the success of the Consortium effort. Initially, it was hoped that peer-nomination techniques could be employed in selection and recruitment; however, workload and time pressures on the human relations offices and other staff of the schools made it impossible to implement the peer-nomination approach. Volunteers were recruited by a variety of means. In general an effort was made to find persons who had strong interests in human relations problems and who were comfortable leading small discussion groups. The schools were asked to recruit one leader for each ten persons enrolling in the course. The discussion leaders would be required to attend two Saturday training sessions, lead five afternoon discussion groups meeting from 3:30 to 5:30 p.m. each Wednesday in October, and complete course-attendance and evaluation forms. The school could not provide additional pay; but, U.C. Education Extension offered two course credits, one for the Workshop and one for the Leader Training, with fees remitted by U.C.

With this inducement, a self-selected and generally committed group of more than 100 teachers was recruited to lead discussion groups composed of staffs from their own (or, in a few cases, neighboring) junior and senior high schools in Oakland and San Francisco.

The first training session was scheduled for 9:30 a.m., Saturday, September 28, 1968, at the Little Theatre, San Francisco City College. This training session was led by Dr. Staten W. Webster, Dr. Paul D. Hood, and Mr. James N. Johnson. The scheduled activities included an opening statement of the purpose and organization of the Human Relations Workshop and of the role to be played by discussion leaders, plus an outline of the discussion-leader training. This was followed by a preview of the first TV program film, followed in turn by a demonstration role-play and discussion of the objectives, content, and recommended leader techniques. The complete film for Program 2 was not ready, but portions of it were shown, supplemented by a verbal description of remaining portions. Again, role-playing and discussion were employed to examine in detail the objectives, content, and recommended procedures.

In the afternoon, the film of the third program was shown and then discussed. During the final segment, dealing with administrative and evaluation procedures and problems, it became obvious that there had been communication failures, and that there would be scheduling, facilities, and equipment problems in several of the schools. Discussion leaders were encouraged to exercise leadership and personal initiative in making arrangements for their own schools and to contact their respective human relations offices if they couldn't find solutions.

An additional session was scheduled at McChesney Junior High School in Oakland on Saturday, October 5, 1968, for preview of the complete film for Program 2 and further discussion of leader-training problems. This was a voluntary session attended by approximately 50 leaders.

On Saturday, October 19, 1968, the second regular training session was held at Oakland High School. Dr. Fannie R. Shaftel joined Dr. Webster, Dr. Hood and Mr. Johnson in conducting this training session. The schedule included an opening review, practice of discussion-leader skills, an introduction to role-playing, the film of Program 4, actual role-playing and discussion regarding content of Program 4, the film of Program 5, and closing remarks on administration, course credit, and evaluation.

One hundred and eight discussion leaders completed the requirement for the discussion-leader course and were awarded class credits by U.C. Education Extension.

V. THE SCHOOL DISCUSSION SESSIONS

The University of California established an accredited course entitled Behavioral and Attitudinal Barriers to Effective Communication in the Secondary Schools (X 327.7, 1 credit). The enrollment fee was set at $20.00, with complementary enrollment for discussion leaders. The two school systems arranged for salary increment credits to be awarded to participating staff who did not wish to enroll for university credit. Arrangements were made to use staff lounges, lunch rooms, student cafeterias, libraries, or classrooms for viewing the televised portion of the course. Viewing groups then divided into smaller groups (ranging from 6 to 20, averaging 10 to 11 persons) to meet with a discussion leader. Discussion leaders' guides, viewers' guides, assignment sheets, and critique forms were used to support or evaluate these sessions.

By 3:30 p.m. each Wednesday, the staff, usually tired and struggling to get to the room in time, prepared to view the program. The leader took roll and distributed materials; Channel 9, KQED, was tuned in.

Each program opened to the provocative music of "Wade in the Water" with the "Experimental Workshop in Human Relations" logo. Thirty minutes later, the program was completed and school staff organized themselves to discuss and, in some cases, role-play the problems and consider solutions for each session. Teachers and other school staff serving 43 Oakland and San Francisco secondary schools were simultaneously considering the same kinds of human relations problems in schools throughout the two cities.

Teams of four to seven observers were sent by the Laboratory each week to randomly selected schools in order to provide immediate feedback to the Consortium. Their reports, which will be considered again in

Section VI, indicated that the viewing conditions were poor, that administrative and staff involvement and support was judged less than adequate, and that the quality of discussion leaders and discussions varied widely from school to school; nevertheless, the discussions were generally considered profitable. In a few cases, the climate was at best neutral and the response was mildly negative to unenthusiastic. Generally, though, it was apparent that the workshop was fulfilling its purpose. Discussions were usually animated, sometimes heated. Problems were being faced, issues examined, views exchanged, opinions expressed, and solutions suggested and evaluated. Black and white, and in a few cases Mexican-American and Oriental, teachers confronted each other and pushed to "see it like it is." Many teachers voiced feelings of frustration. Some condemned "downtown" as well as their own administration. Many recognized that they were talking to a concerned minority of their own staffs, and consistently complained that those who needed the course most were not participating. But most of the staff who did attend were stimulated by the TV program content. The problems and issues presented were considered valid and provocative. At the end of the series, the appraisal of the great majority was that the course had been worthwhile and that they would recommend it to other school personnel. These are very general impressions based on 28 observer reports. In the next section, a slightly more formal evaluation is offered.

VI. EVALUATION

To some extent, the evaluation design of this study has followed the suggestions of Stufflebeam (1968), who distinguishes four kinds of evaluation: context, input, process, and product evaluation. The objective of context evaluation, which is to define the environment where change is to occur, typically includes an identification of needs, problems, goals, and objectives. Input evaluation is concerned with assessment of relevant capabilities, strategies, and designs for achieving project objectives. Process evaluation, which is needed to provide feedback for control and refinement of plans and procedures, is concerned with identifying and monitoring potential sources of failure, whether in the understanding of interpersonal relationships, logistics, facilities, staff, time schedule, etc. Unlike experimental design evaluation, process evaluation does not require control over assignment of subjects or treatments, but rather emphasizes continual information input to improve quality. Product evaluation is used to determine the effectiveness of the project after it has run full cycle.

Context Evaluation

Two relatively major and systematic efforts were undertaken to define the environment, including perceptions of needs, problems, and solutions as well as attitudes and opinions regarding the human relations situation in the Oakland and San Francisco schools. In late spring, 1968, critical-incidents interviews were conducted to provide an empirical base for the selection of program content. In September and early October, a small, random sample of secondary school staff was selected for interview regarding perceptions of problems and response to a number of relevant topics.

The critical-incidents survey. It was noted briefly in Section II that critical-incidents interviews were conducted by two staff members over a three-week interval in late spring in the two school districts. Appendix A provides a more detailed summary of this survey. Thirty-five teachers, eight principals and vice principals, nine counselors and guidance workers, and fifty students were interviewed. A modified critical-incident technique was employed with a typical question of this nature: Can you think of a recent incident that happened to you, or that you saw, which reveals this kind of [human relations] problem? More specific probes (e.g., "Do any rules cause problems?" or "How do the other students feel about this?") encouraged respondents to give concrete examples of what were usually highly generalized statements of feelings and opinions.

Five major categories of incidents were developed after examining the interview protocols. Incidents involving rules and regulations were the most frequently mentioned. In all schools visited, there were reports of many referrals and disciplinary actions for a wide variety of infractions. Teachers seemed to agree that rules and regulations were a real and troublesome problem, but students often felt that school is mindlessly authoritarian. The next highest frequency involved incidents dealing with the use of language when the use of words, phrases, labels and stereotypes were used in a sarcastic or subtly derogatory manner. Next in frequency were complaints about curriculum and teaching practices. Students charged that the subject matter is dull and not relevant to their needs, that teachers don't really care about them, and that teachers lecture about facts rather than leading discussions about causes and issues. Many teachers expressed apprehension about student behavior and protest. Next in frequency of mention, but highest in perceived criticality, were crisis-type confrontations. These involved a wide variety of situations which were often stressful because teachers were unprepared to deal with them. The least frequent and critical of the five major incident categories, but still important enough that frequent, specific examples were given, dealt with ignorance of, or antipathy toward, cultural differences. Some teachers were morally shocked by student language; students often felt teachers are "up-tight" about their music, dress, mode of speech, etc.

The choice of program content is obviously related to the results of this survey. In some cases the episodes presented on the TV programs were derived directly from cited incidents.

The Pre-Series Sampling Survey. In September and early October, 1968, a small, random sample of secondary-school staff was selected from four senior and six "feeder" junior high schools which served student populations representing the entire socio-economic range of Oakland. In each school, the principal was first interviewed and then the names of two men and two women members of the teaching and counseling staff were drawn by random numbers. Whenever possible, individual interviews were arranged. After explaining the Consortium's purpose, the staff member was asked about the kinds of interaction and communication that occurs between school staff and students; specifically, whether there were problem areas in his school, and, if so, what the nature of the problem was, why it was important, and what was being done about it.

The analysis of responses to these questions, which are treated in greater detail in Appendix B, led to the conclusion that human relations problems did indeed exist, and the major problem sources were:

1. Communication failures between school staff and students or parents.
2. The failure of white, middle-class faculty to understand, be concerned about, or be able to relate to and meet the needs of black students.
3. The attitudes and behaviors of "turned-off," apathetic, or militant students who either were not interested in or were challenging the relevance of curriculum content, methods of instruction, and treatment they were encountering in the school.
4. Student discipline, rules, methods of control, and administrative policy for problems ranging from mode of dress to physical assaults on teachers and students.
5. Faculty attitudes and relations, morale, workload, turnover, large classes, tight budgets, and other depressing working conditions.

Slightly over a fourth reported that nothing was being done about these problems. Another fourth gave such answers as a lot of talk, just faculty discussion, meetings and more meetings, response has been too little and too late, people at cross-purposes, etc.

On the other hand, 51 of the 114 cited problems were associated with specific actions, e.g., various efforts at changing student or faculty attitudes or behavior, human relations projects, establishment of new curricula, administrative and individual teacher efforts.

In general these "perceptions of problems" data, which were collected and analyzed by persons who had not dealt directly with the critical-incidents survey or its analysis, tended to corroborate the critical-incident findings.

Following this inquiry regarding problems, each person was asked to complete a randomly assigned "A" or "B" form of an incomplete-sentence form which contained 15 items probing a range of human relations and associated topics. Items such as "The faculty in this school...," "When I talk to students...," and "The Black Power Movement..." were intended to evoke a free response to significant and common areas of school experience which might be relevant to the problem area. (See Table 4 of Appendix B for the list of incomplete-sentence stems.)

No rigorous analysis was attempted for so small a sample; however, a very rough, but reasonably unbiased or representative picture of instructional staff attitudes and opinions can be drawn from them.

There was a wide range of responses to most of the 30 incomplete-sentence items. For some items it was difficult to arrive at a simple, meaningful classification. Nevertheless, some fairly consistent trends emerged, especially from items which were closely related to the same topic or area. For instance, from the items, "The worst thing a teachers faces...," "Discipline in this school...," "School regulations or procedures...," and "School rules...," it was apparent that the majority of those interviewed considered discipline and rules to be a significant school problem. The responses indicate that most teachers felt positive about their jobs, but experienced frustration and even despair about teaching conditions (crowded classes, bureaucratic red tape) and morale of students, ranging from apathy and lack of interest to belligerence. Teachers expressed concern over faculty division and relations, seeing their faculty in two general, polarized groups--the "liberal, progressive, committed" versus the "conservative, traditional, and uncommitted." Over half seemed satisfied with their curriculum but felt greater relevance was a concern. The majority affirmed the existence of racial tension, but felt that the Black Power Movement was mainly positive. The most common response to "Mexican-American students" and "Oriental students" was that there were few of them and they did not constitute a problem, although there are markedly different reactions to these two minorities.

The above statements are intended to suggest rather than summarize the results of the incomplete-sentence information. The careful reader is encouraged to examine Appendix B in detail to understand this information better and to draw his own conclusions concerning the context of attitude and opinion in which the Human Relations Workshop was to be inserted.

Input Evaluation

As we have noted, the purpose of input evaluation is to identify and assess the system capabilities, available input strategies, and designs for implementation. In this respect, our project was seriously constrained in terms of time, resources, conditions associated with funding, etc. A major constraint was that the U.C. Education Extension's funding had to be for some experimental use of television in extension work which could lead to an accredited course in inservice teacher education. After reviewing several alternatives, the two superintendents agreed that human relations was by far the most significant and serious training area. Student complaints, protest, and acts of open violence were increasing at such a rapid, if not alarming, rate that they had become a major item of teacher union negotiation as well as administrative, school board, and community concern.

These problems were sufficiently serious that a course which could be ready in May or June, 1968, was considered. Both the Laboratory and KQED representatives considered such a short production time out of the question. The Laboratory needed enough time to achieve a quality product specifically designed to meet the need and able to be revised on the basis of prototype testing. For KQED, it was a matter of production load and air time schedules. A fall, 1968, target date was the earliest the Laboratory and KQED staffs could accept; it was also the latest the schools could tolerate.

In terms of money, U.C. Education Extension allocated a total of $15,000 to the television development and production. The Laboratory was able to reconsider priorities and revise its budget to make $25,000 available. The schools had no funds, but could provide personnel. Consequently, exclusive of school personnel and support services, the financial limit of the project was $40,000, which had to be utilized by November 30, 1968, in order to meet both U.C. and Laboratory funding deadlines. These funds would have to cover all development costs including salaries, supplies, artwork, film, talent, and TV studio time.

The Consortium would be able to obtain a wide variety of talent and consultant and technical help, either by drawing from their own staffs or from outside sources. Both school districts had well-established human relations offices which had considerable experience in conducting courses, projects and other activities. However, the time personnel of these offices could contribute was limited by their already heavy load of planned and unpredictable but demanding activities which taxed the staffs and budgets of these offices. Moreover, school budgets did not afford any chance of paying teachers to take the course. U.C. Education Extension had a staff which had been working for several years in the human relations and teacher training areas. They were acquainted with the use of film and television as instructional aids, and experienced in the procedures and logistics for conducting extension courses. U.C. could arrange accreditation and remission of fees for discussion leaders. The Laboratory, in cooperation with KQED, had produced three television series, a total of nine quarter-hour and eighteen half-hour programs. The Laboratory maintained relatively complete program development, evaluation, and media production talent and facilities, including a one-inch videotape TV studio and production facility.

There was an additional number of technical constraints regarding available air times, TV production schedules, availability of talent, etc.; but the previous paragraphs outline the basic inputs in terms of capabilities and limitations. What alternatives existed for their use? Major considerations were format, content, technique, administrative, and logistic factors.

Passive viewing of a televised program was rejected in favor of some "programmed" mix of TV plus active group participation. This choice was made primarily on the basis of the previous applied research and development experience of the Laboratory staff, but only after a review of literature and consultation with others. The leadership problems discussion films developed by Lange (1956) provided a general model of proven effectiveness, with the major exceptions that the broadcast program times being considered were probably overly long for the presentation of specific problem episodes. Ideally, after a general orientation, each session should include a film episode, followed by a discussion, another sequence of film, then another discussion. This is possible with motion picture, but was considered technically impractical for the KQED broadcast schedule, although the idea was explored.

In terms of the available time and resources, the decision was to produce five half-hour programs; a larger number of TV films seemed beyond the available resources. Conversely, if two-hour discussion sessions were scheduled, the resulting ten classroom hours would meet the minimum standards of U.C. Education Extension for one course credit or, alternately, allow teachers one unit of salary increment credit by the schools. It was also near the minimum in terms of hoping to make any initial effect on the awareness, sensitization, or attitude change of the participants. It could also be the maximum that teachers might be expected to spend on a voluntary basis in one month's time. (So our assessment led to a compromise on a minimum pilot model of five programs and ten hours of course work.)

The choice of weekly programs was self-evident; to have spaced them more frequently would have imposed an unacceptable burden on most teachers, especially at the beginning of the school year. A less frequent spacing would probably have diminished the effects and created problems in maintaining continuity. Moreover, if the project were extended beyond November 30, 1968, the result would be further budgeting and personnel problems for both the Laboratory and the University.

There was a choice between quarter- and half-hour program length, but very little choice regarding air time. Due to commitments to Instructional and Public Television schedules, the only available air time at this late date was between 3:00 and 4:00 P.M. or before 8:00 A.M. Common sense and previous survey data obtained by the Laboratory on viewing time preferences of Bay Area school personnel led to the selection of

3:30 to 4:00 P.M. on Wednesdays as the least unattractive among an extremely poor set of alternatives. Reasonably good cases could be made for the quarter- or half-hour duration. The decision was to produce half-hour programs because, based on previous production experience, a half-hour program is less demanding in terms of its organization.

It should be mentioned that the alternatives of film and motion picture projection versus TV broadcast were examined, not only initially in terms of media considerations, but again later in terms of the sensitivity expressed by some consultants as to whether program content of this kind should be broadcast. The interpretation of the conditions under which U.C. Education Extension could obtain its funds for experimental television use, as well as of school scheduling and logistic problems, led to the initial and later rejection of use of films or kinescopes. Closed-circuit TV facilities did not exist.

With respect to content, it was decided to focus on immediate, real and critical or frequently encountered problems where there was some hope of solution or amelioration. The major device for identifying needs and problems in this area was a review by the Consortium's advisory committee of the context-evaluation interviews and critical-incidents information.

It would be unduly tedious to detail the many subsequent operational decisions which arose from this input evaluation. The above analysis probably outlines the major factors, except for the rather obvious slighting of the justification for the use of the group discussion and role-playing techniques supported by TV film orientation and stimulus episodes, plus printed auxiliary materials. Analysis of alternatives relating to this choice would require a monograph in itself. A partial bibliography of useful sources in this area is contained in this report.

Process Evaluation

Again, if one refers to Stufflebeam (1968), the purpose of process evaluation is to identify or predict defects in the procedural design or its implementation and to maintain a record of precedural events or activities. The major use of such evaluation is to implement and refine program design and procedures. First, it should be noted that the development cycle design which the Laboratory imposed--a requirement for any significant product of the Laboratory--provides a kind of repeated modification until products do meet specifications or expectations. The production of one-inch videotape prototypes and subsequent testing of persons selected from target populations, with respect to their attitudes, reactions, ability to carry on discussions of topics or role-play following viewing of the tapes, provided for highly intensive and controlled, if somewhat artificial, examination of the human relations package components and their effects. Repeated process/product evaluations with one or more teacher groups and consultant panels for each of three prototypes did much to improve the design of the program components.

In view of previous personal experiences plus logical analysis, many critical areas could be predicted, and in fact many problems were avoided, despite our major difficulties with film production and organization of Programs 1 and 2, which were mentioned previously. Beyond the obvious production-schedule problems, the major anticipated problem areas were: (a) recruiting and selecting discussion leaders; (b) training of discussion leaders; (c) providing adequate publicity; (d) recruiting participating school staff; and (e) obtaining facilities, including TV sets and adequate receiving and discussion areas, in the schools. Experience fulfilled prophecy. Each problem area generally highlighted the communication, administrative support, and staff motivation and morale problems which surrounded and embedded at least some of the human relations problems which the context evaluation had identified.

Recruitment, selection, and training of discussion leaders was considered an overpowering modifier of the program content in terms of effect on schools and their faculty. These problems are eclipsed only by the kind, quality and relative number of faculty who participated in the course. To these two factors, participating staff and the discussion leader, need to be added strong administrative interest and support and an adequate viewing facility at a decent time. These factors were analyzed, explained, and prescribed for the schools. The process evaluation was designed to indicate the status of these factors as well as to obtain immediate information on viewer reaction to the TV program content and the ensuing group discussion sessions.

These data were obtained in two ways, through observation of discussion groups and through analysis of the one-page critique forms which were completed by viewers at the end of each session.

Observer reports. To provide immediate process evaluation feedback, four to seven trained staff members were sent each week to observe and record the discussions in randomly selected schools. The details of these observer reports are contained in Appendix C. To summarize, 28 discussion groups in as many schools were observed. In these schools, the group viewing the TV broadcast ranged in size from 7 to 36 and averaged 18 staff members. Following the TV broadcast, the viewing group divided into small discussion groups (depending on number of trained discussion leaders present) ranging in size from 7 to 20 persons with an average size of 10.5.

The general conclusions, based on the 28 reports, are that planning and organization, both at the district and school level, were less than adequate; tardiness was a consistent problem; viewing conditions were generally judged inadequate; and only about half of the discussion leaders were judged to be adequate when evaluated in terms of: (a) ability to get all the group members to participate; (b) opening up specific issues; (c) sustaining discussions; (d) redirecting theoretical or irrelevant discussions back to the subject; and (e) encouraging participants to move from analysis to suggestion and evaluation of feasible solutions. The reports indicated that effectiveness of discussion was related to effectiveness of leaders. In terms of program objectives, 17 of the 28 discussions were judged successful or useful. The remaining 11 were judged defective for reasons such as: too general or superficial discussion, aggressive domination of discussion by two or three members, or apathy or antagonism which inhibited an honest examination of issues. On the other hand, nearly all reports suggested that the discussions had at least the minimal value of allowing an exchange of views and some exposure to specific human relations problem areas. Nearly all reports also indicated that the TV broadcast programs were at least sufficiently credible and provocative to stimulate active discussion of issues relevant to the situation at each school.

Critique form. The second device for process feedback was a one-page critique form which every discussion member was asked to complete at the end of each session. The forms contained four incomplete sentence stems and four rating items which asked for judgments about the TV program content, relevance, and presentation, and about the quality, significance, and probable effect of the discussion.

Regarding the relevance of program content, the modal response for Programs 1, 2, and 4 was "much relevance"; for Programs 3 and 5 it was "great relevance." For all programs, well over 50% used one of these two ratings. The low percentages of ratings for "spurious issue" and "minor relevance" alternatives for all programs (the highest was 13% for Program 2) indicated that very few perceived any of the programs as dealing with irrelevant problems or issues. This consistently high rating suggested that the content evaluation, chiefly the critical-incidents information, led to an appropriate choice of content. The programs dealing with language and communication (#3) and racial confrontation (#5) were considered of great relevance for approximately 40% of the respondents.

Ratings of program style and presentation had model responses of "quite effective" for all programs except #2 (curriculum relevance) where the modal rating was a step lower, "adequate." In no case did more than a fourth of the critiques indicate that the presentation and style were amateur or clumsy.

In no case did more than 12% consider their discussions to be a "waste of time" or "superficial." The typical rating alternative was "dealt with a few problems in a general way," although half the critiques

Table 1
Percentages for Responses to Program Critique Forms

ITEM	PROGRAM NUMBER 1	2	3	4	5
Program Content Relevance					
1. Spurious issue	01	08	02	01	01
2. Of minor relevance	02	05	04	03	03
3. Of some relevance	28	27	20	25	22
4. Of much relevance	46	38	32	42	34
5. Of great relevance	23	21	42	28	39
Number of responses	332	302	184	229	148
Program Presentation and Style					
1. Presentation clumsy	05	10	09	02	06
2. Amateur	18	15	15	10	12
3. Adequate	35	40	25	33	32
4. Quite effective	40	31	41	43	41
5. Most effective	02	04	09	13	09
Number of responses	321	286	194	229	142
Session Discussion Quality					
1. Wasted time	03	03	02	05	05
2. Superficial	04	06	05	07	04
3. Dealt with a few problems in a general way	54	61	43	44	52
4. Came to grips with significant problems	39	31	50	44	39
Number of responses	341	271	169	214	141
Session Discussion Effect					
1. All talk	08	11	07	12	10
2. May have opened eyes	33	39	30	23	28
3. May change opinions	17	22	21	26	23
4. Could change behavior	22	22	31	30	29
5. Will lead to changes	15	06	12	10	09
Number of responses	379	277	172	223	145

indicated that the discussion following Program 3 (language and communication) "came to grips with significant problems."

Opinions regarding the probable effect of the discussion sessions were spread over all ratings with as many as 12% rating Program 4 as "all talk" and 15% rating Program 1 as "will lead to changes." The median rating for all five programs was "may change opinions." Programs 3, 4, and 5 were rated somewhat higher than Programs 1 and 2.

Appendix D contains details regarding the analysis of the incomplete-sentence stems. This material covers the synopsis, program by program, of completions to four imcomplete-sentence stems:

1. "The most significant thing that occurred in this session was..." Some aspect of the discussion was almost consistently the most frequent response. Aspects of the telecast content were second. The only notable exception concerned Program 2 whose telecast content was mentioned slightly more frequently than discussion content. A third category of statements focused on having learned or become aware of something. Negative responses were never larger than 7% for any session.
2. "In terms of its value for me I would say that..." Responses indicating that the session had no or little value ranged from 8% to 16% for Programs 1, 3, 4, and 5, but increased to 25% for Program 2. In all cases, more than half of the responses indicated that the session was valuable. In terms of the percentage of positive responses, Program 5 (73%) and Program 1 (74%) were outstanding.

3. "Regarding the television broadcast, I believe..." With the exception of Program 2 (48% positive), the majority of the responses were positive; comments about being well done, of some particular value, or realistic characterized many of the responses. Approximately one fourth of the responses (22% to 29%) for Programs 1, 2, 3, and 5 were negative; the percentage for Program 4 was much lower (13%). Consistently encountered were complaints that the treatments were too one-sided, negative, or biased, that positive aspects should be shown, that some situations were incredibile, and that some of the sound was very bad.
4. "The biggest improvement that could be made in this session would be to..." Responses were split between suggestions for television and discussion improvement, with discussion responses generally more frequent. Among these, the most frequent categories were for improvement of content, change of the structure, leadership, or size of the group, or for an increase in participation by making the sessions mandatory for all school staff, as well as parents or students. Among the responses suggesting improvement of the telecast, calls for showing solutions to problems, showing positive incidents and more realistic, less extreme incidents were common. Complaints about sound or other technical aspects ranged from 5% to 12%. Some felt no changes were needed, ranging from 3% for Program 2 to 20% for Progam 5.

Immediate use of process information. Information obtained after the first three programs from the above sources provided immediate feedback that had two influences:

1. Based on the difficulties observed, the discussion leaders' guides for Programs 4 and 5 were rewritten to provide more specific analyses of episodes and additional questions.
2. The planned content of the last discussion leader-training session was revised. Project staff discussed and tried to provide solutions for the difficulties the more inexperienced leaders were having. Solutions were reinforced in the leader-training sessions by role-playing demonstrations in which the more frequently observed or critical discussion problems were enacted together with exploration of various leader responses.

Later use of process information. Following this performance field test in the Oakland and San Francisco schools, further revision of the human relations package will be made and the revised package will undergo operational field testing prior to final revision and release. The information given in Appendices C and D, as well as the primary documentation in the project files, will be studied carefully in making revisions and additions to the package. This material will be particularly useful for (a) revising the film content (and its sound quality), (b) designing the discussion leader training materials, (c) revising the auxiliary printed materials, (d) developing an administrator's manual specifying necessary conditions for effective implementation, and (e) designing the operational assessment instruments so they will be sensitive to areas where process failures are likely to occur.

Product Evaluation

Product evaluation is concerned with relating outcome information to objectives and to context, input, and process information. Its relevance is to decisions to continue, terminate, modify or refocus project direction.

Validity, credibility, impact, feasibility, manageability, conformity to design specifications and objectives, and overall effect are some of the criteria which may be invoked.

There are two major impediments to a classical product evaluation of this project: one is the absence of rigorously defined behavioral objectives; the other is the absence of an adequate experimental design. This project was an experimental or exploratory effort in which developmental design and procedural feasibility were valued more highly than achieving tight data at the risk of loss in participation or perceived value by participants. The objectives, although developed by reasonably careful context evaluation, were very broad. The range of problems encountered and their distribution in terms of incidence and seriousness among the schools was also very broad. In terms of the "change" continuum, the project staff was concerned with creating interest, awareness, and a disposition to analyze problems and consider alternative solutions to selected subsets of problem areas. Each of the five sessions focused on a specific problem area, and the programs moved progressively from the institutional to the personal and from the factual, content-centered issues to the subjective and emotional issues. In Program 1, the focus was on the school and how its "front office" treated, and was perceived by, minority parents and their children. In Program 2, the focus was on instructional content and method in terms of their relevance to the needs and interest of students. Program 3 looked at "hidden language"--the use of offensive terms, phrases, and other verbal and non-verbal messages which can have a negative effect on interpersonal or inter-group relations and communication. In Program 4, confrontations involving school rules and regulations were examined in terms of enforcement, validity, and possible need for change. Program 5 dealt with interpersonal encounters where ethnic or subcultural differences could spark major confrontations.

Throughout the five sessions, the intended emphasis was on a problem-solving style rather than on the acquisition of specific knowledge or skills. The television broadcasts were designed to set the stage, to provide orientation, and to focus on specific problems which would provoke discussion, exchange of opinion, and, perhaps, the development of both problem analysis and examination of alternatives for related specific problems in a particular school. The telecasts did not provide "pat" solutions, although in a very few cases alternative responses were portrayed. The majority of the filmed episodes were deliberately open ended--simply incidents to start discussion regarding their relevance or implication for the experience of a particular school faculty.

The _Discussion Leader's Guide_ and to a lesser extent the _Viewer's Guide_ were designed to assist in the initiation and development of the ensuing discussion. The _Leader's Guide_ contained specific statements of (a) problem focus, (b) aims of the session, (c) program format and content, and (d) suggested group activities and possible approaches. The _Viewer's Guide_ contained a briefer treatment of objectives and program content.

In examination of the TV film and supporting materials, one will note an organized but open structure. This was deliberate. Considerably different needs and concerns exist in two schools where the problems differ from "How can we get the groups to mingle rather than sitting by themselves in assembly and in the cafeteria?" to "How can we reduce the now daily incidence of physical assault by students on other students and staff?"

Some of the incidents shown in the films were considered extremely rare or exaggerated samples of behavior by some school staffs, whereas the same incidents were daily experiences for others. And in a few cases the comment was, "Well, those things happen, but we went through that stage a couple of years ago. Why didn't you deal with some really serious problems like..."

In such diverse situations (contexts), the design of a specific input and specification of an output with limited well-defined criteria, with unambiguous standards, is possible but would be very difficult.

The reader should not conclude that objectives for each program were completely general. The "Aims of Program" section of the Discussion Leader's Guide in Program 4, for example, states that the purpose is to encourage the discussants to re-evaluate rules or regulations that may be out of date, meaningless and silly; needless invasions of privacy; or causes of estrangement. It is pointed out that not all five rules depicted on the broadcast may be relevant to every viewer's school; their purpose is to stimulate discussion. Leaders were asked to be prepared to discuss other rules or regulations which seemed pertinent to their school. Five general discussion questions were posed for any rule, dealing with purpose; validity; effect on students, teachers and process of education; what should be done about unreasonable or troublesome rules; and whether the rule should ever seem more important than the individual. Further specific questions were raised regarding each episode, and the leader was urged to explore, through discussion and role-playing, alternative ways in which teachers might cope with the rule confrontations. From such instructions, one can evaluate discussion process and infer product objectives. But behavioral objectives specifying that a pre-designated percentage of discussants would be able to perform explicit evaluation tasks to meet prespecified standards were not attempted.

At the completion of this development cycle, the project is now at a point where there is sufficient experience--including understanding of what can be done, what should be attempted, and what must be provided--to make it possible to tighten objectives and conduct the assessment in more rigorous terms.

The other product-assessment problem relates to design. Discussion leaders and discussants were self-selected. There is some evidence to support a reasonable assumption that the more motivated members of the staff attended the sessions. Hence, there is a selection bias. Initially, plans for a pre-post evaluation of randomly selected staff as well as participants were made in order to provide some estimate about bias and relative pre-post change for participants and non-participants. The pre-series interviews were conducted and the results are described in the context evaluation section and in the appendices. Time limits, personnel shortages, and scheduling problems seriously restricted the pre-series survey sample size (both individual and school) to the extent that a follow-up has seemed of questionable value.

Another problem for both individual and group effects, but especially troubling for school effects assessment, is causality. During the month of October, one of the school districts mounted a major program in human relations which was not well coordinated with the workshop and which had, at least in terms of scheduling of minimum school days and communication and support from the administration, the appearance of the major district program. This effort clearly confounds the input. Moreover, a variety of events, sometimes triggered by student militancy or violence or by community demands, and occasionally of near-crisis proportion shaped the events in particular schools during October and November, 1968. At the district level, the problem is even more serious; for instance, major changes in rules regarding student attire were made in one district a short time after Program 4, which had dealt specifically with miniskirts and sunglasses in the classroom. Certainly this was circumstantial evidence of an institutional change effect; but inquiry into the reasons for this rule change strongly suggests that students, not faculty, were the primary force for this change.

Thus, specific behavioral objectives, as well as controls in terms of selection, pre-post measures of change, and controls over causal factors are lacking. Such defects are all too familiar to the educational evaluator. To maintain a frank report, they need to be identified and discussed. Aside from the process evaluation described in the previous section, our product information with respect to validity, credibility, impact, etc., rests essentially on one source--an end-of-course critique which was completed on a voluntary basis by discussion leaders and course participants.

Summary of End-of-Course Evaluations Made by Participants

At the end of the fifth session, a four-page questionnaire was distributed to each course participant and discussion leader. At the time the analysis was begun, 285 had been completed and returned. Appendix E treats the responses to each item in this questionnaire, and the interested reader should see it for full details. A brief summary of some of the major items follows.

Most memorable program. A third (35%) of the participants considered the last program on ethnic confrontations to be most memorable; this was followed by Program 3 on hidden language; Program 4 on rules and disciplinary confrontations; Program 1 on the school as encountered by parents; and finally, with 11% selecting it, Program 2 on curriculum content and instructional practice.

Most remembered about discussions. Opportunity for exchange of ideas or sharing of feeling accounted for nearly half of the comments. Other comments indicated that greater awareness or having learned specific things made certain discussions most memorable. On the other hand, 27% made negative comments complaining of generality, lack of action implications, inability of staff to cope with or acknowledge reality, or frustration with small attendance or discussion development.

Personal value of the course. The responses to the question, "Has this course been of any help or use to you?" indicated 83% positive, 13% negative, and 4% ambiguous. The largest category of positive responses indicated value in terms of greater awareness or sensitivity to issues; next most frequent were indications that something had been gained either in terms of content or group process from the discussion; other prominent positive responses focused on what had been learned, on social-emotional support (better communications, better relationships), on increased understanding, on stimulated analysis and evaluation, and on motivation to plan or make changes in behavior.

Effect of the course. Over three-fourths (77%) of those answering the questionnaire listed one or more specific changes that they had made or planned to make as a result of the course. These changes are almost evenly divided among personal, classroom, and school changes. Some 27% were judged as very positive changes with strong "action" components; 35% were rated as positive with moderate or intended action components; 34% were rated vaguely positive with no action and vague intention; and 4% were too ambiguous to classify. Specific examples of each class are cited in the appendix.

Recommendations for course improvement. Nearly half made suggestions for improvement in the course content or media quality. Improved sound, showing solutions, presenting positive and negative incidents in better balance, and more realistic treatment were major themes. Over a third called for structural or organizational improvements, mainly increasing attendance and drawing it from a larger variety of educational personnel.

Adequacy of discussion leader. When responses from leaders and ambiguous answers were excluded, 81% considered their leaders to be adequate or better and 53% judged their leaders to be very good, excellent, or outstanding.

Overall assessment of the course. Answers to the question, "Overall, what is your assessment of this course?" were coded into the following rating scale:

Excellent, much, or great value	17%
Very valuable, very helpful, or very beneficial	20%
Valuable, good, or beneficial	30%
Fair, adequate, satisfactory	12%
Poor, very poor, worthless	8%
No answer	4%
Miscellaneous, not classifiable	9%

A related question asked, "Would you recommend this course for other school personnel?" Ninety-two percent (92%) answered affirmatively, many of them specifying particular groups who would profit most or who should attend. A few suggested limits, e.g., all personnel of schools in "target" areas or front office personnel should see Program 1. Of the remaining questionnaires, 4% said they would not recommend the program, 2% gave ambiguous answers, and 2% did not answer.

Additional or deletions. Three-fourths (76%) of the questionnaires listed one or more recommendations for new or additional subject matter or content; on the other hand, 68% did not believe that anything was ineffective or offensive and must be deleted from the telecasts. Responses to additions and deletions suggest that at least a minority were disturbed by (a) the unrelieved sequence of negative incidents which suggested that teachers were so often wrong or inept, (b) the presence of what some called a "black bias" with white teachers repeatedly cast as "heavies" and with no counterpoint in terms of black responsibilities, (c) the absence of solutions or suggested alternatives for the problems. But there was another minority who wrote to the effect that "Some material hurt, but it was true.."; "Not one thing should be deleted, ...we have been running away from the truth."

Other information. Appendix E, in addition to the above, covers other responses relevant to such items as: Viewer's Guide, exercise sheets, time to be allowed for discussions, and role-playing.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Recommendations

In the light of this evaluation, what conclusions should be drawn? Certainly that the project should be continued and that the selected content and technique seem appropriate. However, some changes in content seem indicated and a number of "implementation" elements must be perfected.

Film content. In regard to the content of the television film programs, the second program on curriculum and instruction is markedly defective. It should be deleted, possibly developed into a series in itself, or substantially revised. The other four programs seem adequate, although a more balanced and less threatening or negative treatment, together with suggestions for solutions (either in the program or in the discussion guides), seems necessary in view of the many complaints encountered, both in the critique sheets and the end-of-course questionnaires. Since the material will be used in film form, it is strongly recommended that discussions be scheduled after each episode rather than after viewing the film from beginning to end.

Printed matter. With respect to the auxiliary printed materials, the discussion leaders' guides seem adequate, although those for Programs 1, 2, and 3 should be revised along the lines of those for Programs 4 and 5. The Viewer's Guide needs major revision. If the film is stopped following each episode, better use might be made of the space for comment. The suggestion made by one participant that viewers record their feelings about each episode might be explored. In any case, more detail is needed. In effect, the Viewer's Guide needs to be more like the Discussion Leader's Guide and should contain an introduction to the course. The assignment sheets, which generally were not used, also present a problem. If viewers had more time, i.e., minimum day rather than voluntary, after-school time, and if the leaders made them part of the course, they might enjoy greater use. As used now, they are an appendage. Of those using them, some reported that they were useful, but many saw no value in them. If assignment sheets are used, their content must be reviewed.

Leader training. It seems clear that the observers were less generous in their evaluation of the leaders than were the course participants, perhaps due to different standards. The discussion leader training sessions focused primarily on program content and general aspects of discussion. Specific training in discussion and role-playing skills was presented, but probably too briefly. It might be useful to review the criteria used by the observers: (a) ability to get all the group members to participate, (b) opening up specific issues, (c) sustaining discussions, (d) redirecting theoretical or irrelevant discussion back to the subject, and (e) encouraging participants to move from analysis to the suggestion and evaluation of feasible solutions. These outcomes call for a larger but manageable set of skills. Less experienced leaders needed to learn how to bring the non-participant into the discussion, how to control someone who dominated the discussion, how to redirect the discussion, etc.

Half the respondents indicated that their group had at least tried role-playing, and the majority found it a valuable experience. But role-playing was not frequently used; many leaders felt uncomfortable with it, primarily due to lack of experience. Most of the evidence suggests that it should be encouraged, but it is equally evident that more actual practice must be given to the leaders and that a larger number of role-assignment sheets with more specific suggestions would be desirable.

Administration. The administrator must clearly understand a number of responsibilities connected with implementing the human relations workshop.

Basically, the human relations package is like any other instructional device in that so much depends on how it is used, by whom, and under what conditions. It is not "leader proof" or "situation proof." If poorly used, it is a waste of time or worse; if it is well used, it can be a useful tool.

The administrator must give attention to the following items.

1. His own objectives and motivation. He must be willing to provide the interest and support needed, and be prepared for the possible consequences.
2. Recruitment and selection of leaders. There is no sure method, but, if there is time, faculty should be encouraged to nominate by secret ballot their own leaders, based on a brief description of the job. Prospective leaders should be selected and then recruited from those receiving frequent nominations. In general, administrative staff should not be chosen as leaders.
3. Composition of course participants. There is much to be said for a mandatory course presented on school time. If this procedure is followed, discussion groups should be held to twelve or fewer participants and mixed as much as possible, unless departmental or grade-level action is desired. In general, activities involving a heterogeneous group with varied viewpoints and interests would be more profitable than a sharing of homogeneous opinions and experiences. If the course is to be voluntary, strong administrative support and interest may increase participation. When only 10 or 15% of the faculty participate, much frustration accompanies any hope of accomplishing any school-wide change. All school personnel should see Program 1. There is no reason why parents or students would not add significantly to the discussion

following any program, if the staff are sufficiently secure and able to handle their own differences of opinion. In general, principals or other supervisors seem to inhibit the discussions. It is sometimes prudent for them to retire during discussion periods, but remain available to consider recommendations which may be developed in a summary period following group discussions.

4. The sessions should be scheduled at a desirable time and location. This point seems obvious, but the observer reports indicated that some locations were far from optimal. Problems encountered with the TV sets and viewing conditions will be avoided with the film versions.
5. Follow-up activities are probably the most important thing the administrator needs to attend to. This course is open ended: it has been deliberately designed to promote awareness and encourage change. The administrator must know what is in the course and how his staff has reacted to it, and must be prepared to entertain suggestions and support reasonable requests arising from exposure to the course. Moreover, he would be wise to find ways to reinforce and maintain staff efforts which would go beyond those made in the workshop.

In the root sense of the word "education," the intent of this workshop is to "lead out," not to train. Moreover, human relations is a cooperative effort, in which all must participate. If the course succeeds, it will create new problems arising from awareness, interest, and motivation to find solutions to other problems. If a school's faculty and administration are unprepared or unwilling to face these new problems concerned with improving the human relations in their school, they should be advised against using the course.

Conclusion

This is an interim report describing development and evaluation of the human relations course through the main or performance field test. The next steps, now already initiated, involve a major revision of the existing components on the basis of the evaluation information. In addition to these revisions, a complete, self-contained discussion leader training component and an administrator's manual may be anticipated. These new elements will be pilot tested and the entire "operational" package will be further tested in schools prior to its release for general use. In view of the performance field test results and general interest expressed by other school personnel who have seen the workshop films, it seems highly likely that this project will lead to a useful and valued product, fully justifying the developmental effort and fulfilling the Consortium's expectations.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

A Summary of Problem Areas Identified Via Critical-Incidents Interviews

Samples

The Human Relations Departments of both the Oakland and San Francisco School Districts arranged for project staff to go into their schools to interview students, teachers, counselors, and principals. The Consortium explicitly asked to see a cross-section of people: teachers,ranging from "conservative" to "liberal" or "progressive" in outlook, and students ranging from very successful achievers to "trouble-makers" and non-achievers. It sought to perceive the problem from a variety of viewpoints, and to try, as far as possible, to get an objective view of it.

The project staff was provided with such a cross-section, and over a three-week period interviewed the following:

35 Teachers (20 white, 15 black; 10 male, 25 female);
8 Principals and vice principals;
9 Counselors and guidance workers; and
50 Students (23 boys, 27 girls; 20 black, 15 white, 9 Oriental, 6 Mexican-American).

Both students and teachers were interviewed singly and in groups.

Interview Procedure

The interviewer introduced himself as an employee of Far West Laboratory, a non-profit organization whose purpose is to improve education. He explained the Consortium and how it proposed to help create a better educational climate in the schools by dramatizing for teachers significant problems of human interaction, especially between students and school personnel, so that they could explore ways to rectify them. It was stated that the Consortium was specifically interested in human relations problems, that is, the attitudes, beliefs, feelings, or behavior people display toward each other which alienate and impede communication. It was explained that the objective of the interview was to find out what the problems were. Anonymity was guaranteed.

For example, one leading question asked teachers was: Can you think of a recent incident that happened to you, or that you saw, which reveals this kind of problem? This question was often followed by a "probe": Have you sent a student to the office recently? Do you feel that students don't like school or teachers, that they feel alienated? Why? Do you think some teachers are prejudiced? Is there a racial problem in this school? Do any rules cause problems?, etc. More specific information was then sought.

The same basic information about the Consortium was given to students, who were told our purpose was to help teachers become better teachers by encouraging them to examine unacceptable or ineffective behavior patterns, with the idea of changing them, and that it was important for all concerned to understand how the students perceive such behaviors.

The initial question asked them was the same one asked the teachers. The probes encouraged the student to give concrete examples of generalized feelings and opinions.

Results

The following are samples of consistently cited behaviors that impede the educational process. Whether the problem is one of miscommunication between individuals (stemming from ignorance or misunderstanding) or one of aggressive communication (whereby an individual accurately conveys his indifference, prejudice, or hostility), the result in each case is inimical to good human relations.

It should be noted here that these categories of perceived problems corroborated previous assessments of the problem based on practical experience and literature search.

According to critical-incidents interviews held, the most universal and persistent of the unacceptable behaviors are these:

1. Rules and regulations. This category evinced highest frequency of mention and was perceived as critical. Both teachers and students said that many rules and regulations were unreasonable or mishandled. In all schools visited, informants reported many referrals and disciplinary actions about such things as gum-chewing, dress styles, tardiness, not having pencils or books. Teachers seemed to agree that rules and regulations presented a very real and troublesome problem. Students, on the other hand, generally felt that school is mindlessly authoritarian, "like a prison," and cited many incidents:
   "Get that matchstick out of your mouth."
   "You know you can't wear sunglasses in the hall."
   "You're not supposed to be in the halls now."
   On the other hand, teachers complained that no matter how reasonable certain requests were made, they were often met with utter defiance:
   "Try and take the glasses off me."
   "You can't tell me where to go."
2. Offensive use of words, phrases, labels, and stereotypes. This category was highest in frequency of mention and was perceived as critical. Examples are the following:
   a. Calling attention to a person's membership in a minority,

√

racial, or ethnic group in a way which may be perceived as derogatory (whether intended or not). Many condescending uses of such phrases as "you people" are reported.

Nurse (sarcastically): "You people are always coming to me with things you should've taken care of at home."

Teacher: "Why are you acting that way? You know you can't afford to, you have more to overcome (than other students or other people)."

Other comments reported: "You people never seem to be able to get anything done on time." "You are making a very poor example of your people." "I guess you people are hard of hearing."

b. Using terms such as "boy" and "girl" that have traditionally been used in a condescending way to Negro adults, and which consequently have acquired insulting connotations.

c. Labeling a person as "lower-class," "culturally deprived," or "retarded," which offends one's dignity.

d. Using sarcastic or subtly derogatory language as a means of discipline, i.e., correcting grammar or manners.

3. Curriculum and teaching practice. This category was second highest in degree of perceived criticality, and high in frequency of mention. Students consistently charged that subject matter was dull and not relevant to the times or to the students' personal needs. They also felt that teachers didn't really care about them. Teachers lectured about facts and didn't ask "whys"; they didn't allow or lead discussions.

Many teachers averred this was generally true and felt they needed help to correct the situation: How do you talk about civil rights in Oakland, when you have reams of required subject matter to cover? How do you become personally involved with thirty-five students?

Many teachers felt apprehensive and said the students were getting out of hand with regard to rules and discipline.

4. Crisis-type confrontations: Although moderate in frequency of mention, this category had the highest degree of perceived criticality. Teachers cited a wide variety of situations which could become stressful encounters and with which they felt unprepared to deal. For example, one teacher reported that she felt it necessary in a classroom situation to be very firm at the outset, or run the risk of losing control of the class. During a class session, a young girl came up to this teacher and said very aggressively, "Gimme a pass. I gotta go to the john." The teacher replied that she didn't give passes and told the girl to sit down. The girl immediately went to the middle of the room and danced up and down saying, "O-o-o! I got to pee," over and over. This led to some disruption of the classroom situation, a consequent exchange of threats, and the teacher referred the girl to the principal's office.

   Another teacher reported that, while on yard duty, one of a group of boys came up and asked her, "What you lookin' at? What you doin' here?" The teacher responded that she was yard supervisor and was only trying to do her job and to see what was going on. The boys asked again, "Well, what are you lookin' at us for?" They then began to form a circle around her and to close in. She was finally surrounded and became terrified. She didn't remember what they said to her. The vice principal happened to come by and stopped the boys, whose "leader" was taken to the office and disciplined.

Similar situations included militancy toward the curriculum, conflict between students, etc.

5. Ignorance of, or antipathy toward, cultural differences. Of the five categories, this was least cited and perceived as least critical. It is still important enough that frequent examples were given:
   a. "I dig you, baby," meant by a student as a sincere compliment, was taken by a young lady teacher as a verbal sexual assault.
   b. "man, you got a bad front," (Bad front signified good-looking suit.)
   c. Teacher had math students construct a purchase problem which involved determining the price of a new TV and payments. One student worked out a payment schedule based on a total price of $62.50:

      Teacher: Wait a minute; we weren't talking about used (TVs.)
      Student: No, this is a new TV.
      Teacher: A new one! What kind of TV is it?
      Student: (seriously): A hot one.

      The teacher is insulted, but a "hot" TV is a communal reality to that student.
   d. Teachers were morally shocked by a certain kind of profanity that is everyday language to some and not intended as insulting.

e. Students often felt teachers were "up-tight" about their music, dress, or mode of speech.

Appendix B

Pre-Series Sampling Survey of School Staff Perceptions, Attitudes and Opinions

In September and early October, 1968, a small, random sample of secondary-school staff was selected and contacted to provide a more rigorous examination of instructional staff perceptions, opinions, and attitudes. The four high schools and six "feeder" junior high schools which were selected ranged over the entire socio-economic spectrum of the Oakland Unified School District. In each school, the principal was first interviewed and then samples of two male and two female teachers or counselors were randomly selected.[1] Wherever possible, individual interviews were arranged. After explaining the purpose, the interviewer asked about the kinds of interaction and communication that took place between school staff and students. Specifically, he asked whether there were problem areas in their schools, and if so, what the nature of the problem was, why it was important, and what was being done about it. He then asked the teacher to fill out a fifteen-item incomplete-sentence form which probed a range of human relations-related items.

Nature of Perceived Problems

In his interviews with school personnel the interviewer's first question was posed this way:

> Since beginning this project we have discovered that quite a few school people are concerned about the kind of

---

[1] In a few schools, an additional questionnaire was completed. Forty-four interviews were held. In five cases, the incomplete-sentence forms were collated incorrectly. There are 19 complete "A" forms and 20 complete "B" forms, plus additional data from five persons, which increases the counts to 21 for the "A" form and 23 for the "B" form. Counts for specific items will sometimes be less because of failure to answer specific items. In cases where an originally selected person could not be reached or scheduled, an alternate was selected.

> interaction and communication that takes place between and among school staff and students. Do you think that there are any problem areas in this school?

Ninety-one problems were mentioned. These are classified in Table 2 below:

Table 2

Content Analysis of Reported Human Relations Problems

Communication failures between staff and students or parents	15
White, middle-class faculty failure to relate to or meet black student needs	15
Poor student attitude, apathy, tardiness, truancy	10
Disciplinary problems, rules, punitive policy	8
Authoritarian response of administrators	5
Teacher or office-staff attitudes and hostility toward minorities	5
Student unrest, militancy, intruders, violence, police	5
Poor staff relations, morale, uncooperativeness, etc	5
Large classes, physical crowding, inability to give individual attention	4
Faculty problems in adjusting to a changing student body	3
Ineffective use of counselors, lack of guidance information	2
High faculty turnover	2
Problems of encouraging or involving black students in school activities	2
Miscellaneous problems--not classified	19
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROBLEMS:	91

Sixteen problems involved some kind of failure in communication between school staff and students or parents. Fifteen problems dealt with inability or unwillingness of white, middle-class faculty to relate, either in terms of instructional content or personal interest, to the needs of black students. Ten problems could be classified as concerned with poor student behavior or attitude toward the school, including lack of respect for staff, chronic tardiness and truancy, and general apathy toward education. Eight problems dealt essentially with discipline problems, including complaints about school rules and punitive policies. Five problems expressed concern over authoritarian responses by school administrators to challenges by minority militants. Another five problems centered on teacher or front-office-staff hostile attitudes or behavior toward minority students or parents. Five more problems involved student unrest, militancy, outside students visiting the school, too much emphasis on police, and occasions of physical attacks on staff and other students. Another five problems concerned relations among the faculty with complaints of uncooperativeness, poor morale, and extreme differences of attitudes. Four complaints dealt with problems created by large classes, physical crowding, and inability to give individual attention to student problems and needs. Three mentioned the problems of staff adjusting to a changing student body with less than adequate educational preparation. The remaining problems were not easily grouped, although complaints of ineffective use of counselors, high staff turn-over, and problems of encouraging students to participate in school activities were mentioned at least twice.

Each respondent who listed such a problem was asked, "What is being done about it?"

There were 114 classifiable responses to the 91 problems. (More than one action was mentioned for some problems.) These are summarized below in Table 3.

Table 3

Type of Action Being Taken in Reported Human Relations Problems

Nothing, or don't know of anything	30
Mainly talk, meetings, committees, plans	17
Something, but not consistent; or too little, too late	10
People are working, but at cross-purposes	3
Efforts at changing student attitude or behavior through class discussions, assemblies, clubs, counseling	13
Human relations projects or seminars	7
New curricula or other effort to improve instruction and interest	7
Miscellaneous specific action with individual students	5
Teacher-training programs and other specific efforts to change teacher attitudes and understanding	5
Orientation programs for students and parents	3
Contact parents	2
Genuine administrative effort to reduce staff workload	2
Punishment of student offenders	2
Individual efforts to work on problem	2
Miscellaneous actions	3
No or ambiguous response	3
TOTAL NUMBER OF REPORTED ACTIONS:	114

Slightly over a fourth of the teachers and counselors said that nothing was being done about the problems they reported. Another fourth gave answers such as:

> A lot of talk; just faculty discussion; meetings and more meeting, but nothing else; the response has been too little and too late; people are working at cross purposes, etc.

Fifty-one (out of 114) specific actions were mentioned. Efforts at changing student attitude or behavior through classroom discussions, school assemblies, clubs and other organized activities or through talking informally with groups or individuals was the most frequently mentioned type of action. Human relations projects and seminars, establishment of new curricula or other efforts to make class work more interesting or relevant, miscellaneous actions with individual students, and training programs or other efforts directed at teacher understanding or effort were also mentioned by several persons. Orientation programs, contacting parents, administrative efforts to reduce staff workload, punishment of student offenders, and individual efforts by teachers (where group action seemed hopeless) were mentioned at least twice.

The classifications and interpretations given above are not objective measures, but rather an effort to communicate the general nature of free responses given by the teachers and counselors whom we interviewed. The frequency counts might not be the same if coded by someone else and other classifications could be proposed; but anyone reading the interview records would probably conclude that major problems or problem sources were:

1. Communication failures between school staff and students or parents.
2. The failure of white, middle-class faculty to understand, be concerned about, or be able to relate to and meet the needs of black students.

3. The attitudes and behaviors of "turned-off," apathetic, or militant students, who either were not interested in or were challenging the relevance of content, method of instruction, and treatment they were encountering in the school.
4. Student discipline, rules, methods of control, and administrative policy for problems ranging from mode of dress to physical assaults on teachers and students.
5. Faculty attitudes and relations, morale, workload, and turnover, together with large classes, tight budgets, and other depressing working conditions.

Anyone, despite his method of coding or classification, would also be struck with the high proportion of responses where staff could identify little or nothing in the way of positive or promising response to these problems.

Attitudes and Conceptions Toward a Variety of Human Relations and Related Subjects

Following inquiry regarding problems in the schools and what was being done about them, each interviewee was asked to complete an "A" or "B" form (randomly assigned) of an incomplete-sentence blank (See Table 4).

Items on the two forms were roughly paired in terms of the areas they probed, although the forms were not "alternate" or "equivalent." The reason for the two forms is simply a wish to explore response to a larger number of items than would be reasonable to ask of one person.

On the following pages can be found the synopsis of the analysis of each sentence-completion item. The headings are the exact statements of the items. The following parentheses contain a letter indicating whether the item was on the "A" or "B" form, and a number indicating the number of completed sentences for that item. In cases where "A" and "B" items are similar, comparisons can be made, recalling that the "A" and "B" responses are from random, approximately paired samples.

Table 4

Items Used in the Two Incomplete-Sentence Forms

1.	My job in this school	1.	The faculty of this school
2.	My students	2.	My students learn best
3.	The worst thing a teacher faces	3.	Discipline in this school
4.	The relevance of what we teach	4.	The curriculum
5.	The neighborhood this school serves	5.	Students from lower class homes
6.	School rules	6.	School regulations or procedures
7.	Mexican-American students	7.	Oriental students
8.	When I talk about school, my friends	8.	What I like to do most
9.	Language and communication in the classroom	9.	When I talk to students
10.	Racial tensions in this school	10.	The Black Power Movement
11.	Student behavior	11.	Courtesy and respect
12.	Arguments in the classroom	12.	Profanity in the classroom
13.	I often wish	13.	The average day in this school
14.	Discussion among the school staff	14.	The greatest hope for this school
15.	I get mad when	15.	Student protest

Because of the small size of the samples, a rigorous analysis was not attempted and should not be assumed. All answers to an item (incomplete-sentence stem) were read, grouped, and tallied. If a completion fit several classification (coding) groups, it was tallied in each; hence, the reported number of responses (tallies for a group of similar responses) may not equal the number of sentences. In most cases the completions were short and relatively simple and could be assigned to only one category. Examples of words or phrases are given to suggest the content. In nearly all cases, the illustrations are paraphrased or abstracted and considerably shorter than the actual sentences.

Because of the nature of the sample, considerable care should be used in drawing conclusions or generalizing. Two men and two women who were either teachers or counselors on the staff of four (4) senior and six (6) junior high schools were selected, by random numbers. Thus a small and specially constituted cross-section of a school district's instructional staff has been made available. With samples this small, the sentence-completion classification counts should be considered as suggestive; the counts themselves are not very dependable.[2] They give a kind of reasonably unbiased or representative, but very rough, picture of how an instructional staff reacted to a selected set of words or phrases.

My job in this school... (A,20) Eleven respondents used terms such as: important, interesting, exciting, challenging and enjoyable. Seven of the responses were essentially statements of subjects taught such as,

---

[2] Another analysis could lead to quite different classifications, and tally by another coder using the same classification could lead to a slightly different count; but mainly the standard error of these reported frequencies (or proportions) is so large that... For example: if 10 of 20 responses

Spanish or teaching learning-disability classes; and two more dealt with general goals (e.g., "to change attitudes and behaviors, to get students to think"). Four of the 20 responses used terms such as hectic, difficult and frustrating, whereas two others spoke of their jobs as being fearful or "scary."

The faculty of this school...(B,23) Ten were positive and nine were negative. Positive terms included: dedicated, concerned with school problems, good, hardworking, fine group of people, anxious to do a good job, effective in the classroom, relaxed. Negative terms included: tired, frustrated, despairing, too many inexperienced teachers, not interested in students, can't teach if students aren't ready or willing to learn, unable to do much within the system. Besides these general positive or negative terms, eight of the sentences dealt specifically with faculty division, using phrases such as: lack of team spirit, could be more united, does not work together, uncooperative. Only two sentences specifically mentioned: good working relationships, are most helpful to one another.

My students...(A,20) Four completions used terms such as: fabulous, bright, the greatest. Six described students as serious in desire to learn, want to learn, willing or eager to learn. Two sentences spoke of being able to direct "with ample, sincere effort" and "have interest, think I can get them moving." Three were more neutral: vary greatly in interest for my subject, well behaved, likable. Nine contained problem

---

2 (cont'd)
were classified a certain way, there would be a 5% confidence region of 5 to 15. That is, the chances are slightly less than 5 in a 100 that the "true" count in the population could be anywhere from 5 to 15. If the count for a particular classification were 5 out of a total of 20 responses, the confidence region for the "true" count would be between 1 and 9.

themes: e.g., are two years behind, some have neurological problems, not eager to learn, not motivated, still "turned-off," are just beginning to settle down, need lots of help, require more attention that I can give. One spoke of variety of racial background and another of performing well where physical strength and skill are needed.

My students learn best when...(B, 23) The completions to this stem suggested a variety of conditions. Six mentioned close supervision, clear instructions, and understanding of what is expected of them. Five emphasized the need for choosing subjects and examples they can relate to or that they know or understand what they are doing. Another five emphasized the need for quiet, calm classes. Three called for smaller classes and adequate time to devote attention to needs, and another three stressed the importance of personal interest in subject matter or in the student and his accomplishments. Absence of trouble makers, a friendly, but firm atmosphere, and "learn best when it's too late" were each suggested once.

The worst thing a teacher faces...(A, 19) Two frequent themes, each accounting for five out of the nineteen completions, were: (a) the apathy, lack of interest, and lack of motivation of some students and (b) being unable to teach because of lost interest, belligerence, or lack of student self-discipline or control. Excessive clerical work, time-consuming routines, administrative red tape, lack of time or facilities, too large classes, and lack of support from the community characterized the remainder of the completions.

Discipline in this school...(B, 22) Responses to this stem clearly indicated that discipline was a problem area. Only four said discipline was good and all four had reservations such as "considering the students we work with" or "as one could expect". Over half the responses were clearly negative or critical, using terms such as: difficult, terrible, awful, lousy, a major problem, chaotic, inconsistent, only exists in some classrooms. Three considered it "lax" and the remainder were less critical, but called for some kind of improvement.

The relevance of what we teach...(A, 20) Five responses stressed or explained the importance of making instruction meaningful. Four stated that relevance depended on the teacher, the students, or the methods used. Four more gave specific explanations of what they did to make instruction relevant. Six were critical, using terms such as: may be intangible to our students, is questionable, has little to do with what students really need, is not apparent to most students. One response indicated that the teacher would need more time to make a satisfactory assessment.

The curriculum...(B, 22) Twelve of twenty-two, slightly over half the responses, described the curriculum as adequate or better, some using terms such as: fine, suitable, very good and complete, being up-dated constantly, seems to meet the needs of many of the students. Ten responses were critical or called for improvements: too difficult, not geared to this sub-community, needs improvement, seems to be dull, not flexible enough to reach some students, is ten years behind, geared to middle-class whites, is irrelevant.

The neighborhood this school serves...(A, 20) This stem elicited a wide variety of responses which are not easily classified. Six described the neighborhood as complex or integrated and three others identified it as predominantly middle-class with students bussed in from poorer areas. Five responses dealt specifically with change or stability, e.g., stable, but school has no contact, stable after transition, is changing ethnically. Lack of community organization was prominent in two descriptions while a third response mentioned a community with problems that was organizing. With the exception of those identifying the neighborhood as complex or integrated, only eight of the twenty responses made specific reference to socio-economic background such as middle class or very poor.

Students from lower-class homes...(B,---) Through an oversight, this stem was omitted on most of the questionnaires. The number was too small to warrant reporting on content, but the few responses suggest that the stem does elicit useful information about staff attitudes toward such students.

School rules...(A, 20) The major theme in responses to this stem was enforcement or its lack. Six responses called for rules which could and would be enforced or for strict and fair, flexible and well-enforced rules. On the other hand, eight responses were critical, calling rules complicated, out of date and unfair, or condemning rigid or inconsistent enforcement. Three of these more critical responses specifically criticized lack of student involvement in formulating the rules.

School regulations and procedures...(B, 22) Of twenty-two responses, seven were clearly positive, using terms such as: reasonable, fair, good, not difficult to follow, handled well by administration. Six were critical of enforcement, e.g., are fine if they are enforced, need to be enforced, are not enforced. Five used terms such as: seems to be confusing, unclear, not spelled out clearly enough. Three described them as inconsistent. Need to review and change rules more frequently to meet changing school situations was a theme in two sentence completions.

Mexican-American students...(A, 20) Eleven sentences mentioned number or percentage mainly indicating that there were not many or they were a small minority of the student body. Six responses dealt with positive qualities, e.g., very courteous, normally cooperative, good students if they understand, good in my subject area. Three responses mentioned alienation, apathy, and lack of interest. Three others mentioned problems: need extra help, truancy, copy poor behavior of others.

Oriental students...(B, 23) Ten responses indicated there were few or no Oriental students. Seven completions mentioned studiousness, excellent students, best in academic subject, etc. Four stressed striving, hard workers, highly motivated. Four mentioned home influences such as family pride and discipline. Four used terms such as courteous, cooperative, well behaved. Miscellaneous responses were: command respect of other students, fun and joy to teach, are cute, have the same problems as other students.

When I talk about school, my friends...(A, 19) Eight completions indicated receptive interest, using such terms as: interested, listen, share my thoughts, are understanding, ask if we, too, are having problems. Six suggested lack of understanding, ignorance, disbelief or surprise concerning school incidents. The remaining responses were quite miscellaneous, e.g., feel sympathy for me; seem to feel the whole situation is a mess; say oh, yes, you are from that school; I don't talk too often; are impressed that Negroes react with middle-class expectations.

What I like to do most...(B, 22) Fourteen completions to this stem specifically mentioned some aspect of the learning situation or response of students, e.g., work with students, see a child enjoy learning, see change, teach receptive children regardless of race, teach a skill, get a discussion going, feel cooperation and enthusiasm develop in students. Two completions mentioned discovering or creating better ways to solve problems and two mentioned personal professional development or accomplishment. The remainder were miscellaneous, e.g., direct plays, talk with people.

Language and communication in the classroom...(A, 20) Six responses indicated there was no problem; it was excellent, good, understandable, or adequate. Two stressed communication as of great importance to learning; four mentioned need and ways to improve communication, three mentioned difficulties in student understanding or teacher-student speech differences. Miscellaneous responses mentioned frequency of use of slang and four-letter words, sub-standard English, and in one case said, "It never stops in my classroom."

When I talk to my students...(B, 22) Completions to this stem were quite varied. At least half dealt with some kind of concern for two-way communication; of these, four stressed an effort to understand what students are saying or to follow their logic; two said they try to listen; two indicated they talked about subjects students were interested in and wanted to discuss; two said they tried to help students understand their own problems. Two additional completions emphasized the need for quiet, relaxed, casual, warm converstaions, but with occasional firmness. Two completions stressed positive affect, i.e., I enjoy it, I like to feel I am communicating. One expressed amazement at student maturity and three focused on the response, i.e., they had better listen, I get their attention, they are respectful.

Racial tensions in this school...(A, 20) The completions, dealing mainly with presence and amount of tension, ranged over the entire continuum. Nine indicated a serious or growing problem, six stated that it exists, and five indicated that there is no or little tension. Terms used by the first group are: at an all-time high, quite high this year, certainly very serious, quite tense lately, have been bad, present at all times, are growing with outside social problems, are more in the open and more unsettling to faculty. The second group said: exists, but not at crisis stage; not absent; does play a role in the climate; not as severe as other parts of city; in the first few days made students sad; are better than last year. In the last group, two stressed cultural differences rather than tensions, per se; other terms were: do not appear high, at minimum, does not exist. Regarding content, one response indicated tension among faculty as well as students, another referred to black student taunts to black teachers as "out to get a soul brother," a third indicated the senior class was working to reduce them, and a fourth said it was hard to assess the situation because the administration didn't keep teachers informed.

The Black Power Movement...(B, 21) The majority of the completions viewed the movement as good, necessary, or useful, although there were a number of reservations. In fact, only two responses were totally negative i.e., seems selfish and narrow, is a bunch of junk. Three others indicated the movement had had little or no serious effect on campus. Thirteen of the completions were predominantly positive, using phases such as: needs to be, is necessary to change American institutions, has channeled hostility, has great merit, fine as it promotes pride and dignity (six responses mentioned pride, dignity or positive self-image), has some good points, is a good idea. On the other hand, three completions mentioned that the movement had frightening or personally threatening elements, and six mentioned some weaknesses or negative elements such as: like a windstorm moving with intensity in many directions, its methods do it an injustice, questionable if it disregards the family of man, needs a great amount of leadership and direction, attempts to indoctrinate hatred of whites, generates hostility.

Student behavior...(A, 20) Responses to this stem ran the entire range from very good to very bad and were fairly evenly balanced. Three used terms such as excellent or very good on the whole. Four on the opposite extreme said: could be improved, needs changing, not as good as used to be, and very bad. In between were phrases such as: generally good when adequately supervised; noisy and playful, but not malicious; could be better as well as worse; poor in a middle-class sense, but refreshing in energy and honesty. Four content themes were (a) behavior is mixed, most good, some bad; (b) a few bad or rowdy students can disturb or set off a whole class; (c) student behavior is different, more energetic, noisier, physically aggressive, lack manners, mischievous--which is normal for these children, but unsettling to many teachers; and (d) that it is changing, for the better or the worse, or like it has always been.

Courtesy and respect...(B, 22) The responses to this stem can be classified into: (a) status in the school, (b) requirements for fostering, or (c) descriptive or prescriptive cliches. Of eight status completions, three said courtesy and respect were good or okay, five said they could be better or are lacking among many students. Of eight requirements for fostering, six stressed that they must be jointly held or have to work both ways; and two stressed that they have to be taught, not expected, that they can't develop in a vacuum. The six "cliches" used phrases such as: can be acquired by anyone, are worthwhile virtues, are due all, should be expected.

Arguments in the classroom...(A, 20) The most frequent class of completions, nine in number, was that arguments rarely happen. Six responses stated conditions or frequency e.g., arise all the time; are usually about drugs, parental control or interracial dating; are long, loud and tend to polarize discussions; mostly arise from teasing; are what can be expected of this age group. Three responses carried the theme of being healthy, but must be controlled or they led to fights rather than debate. Two responses stated that they were encouraged and were stimulating if over subject matter.

Profinity in the classroom...(B, 22) Three said profanity was rare or non-existent, fourteen indicated that it existed, with six of these indicating it was common and one stating it was a problem. Attitudes toward profanity split: seven state that it should not be tolerated, or must be controlled; while eight viewed it as a necessary or excusable event, a natural part of the language or idiom of some students, or simply as something which is better controlled by not reacting or over-reacting.

I often wish that...(A, 19) The largest single theme (7 responses) dealt with having smaller classes, or greater opportunity to know and work with students individually. Five more dealt with finding some way to get students interested or motivated to enjoy learning or to create a climate where student potential could be developed. Two called for more money or support for the schools. Other wishes were for: better-grounded students, some way to isolate troublemakers, more time to build teacher aids, some way to help parents help their children, a shorter and more effective school day.

The average day in this school...(B, 20) Five completions used terms such as great, pleasant, fine, pretty good; but five others used terms such as pretty hectic, beyond belief, frustrating and defeating, boring and dull. Five used terms like active challenge, busy, tiring, very hard work, long hours, but all with a tone or statement that it was worthwhile. Two completions indicated that it varied, the average day never occurred. Other completions were neutral or ambiguous, e.g., is 6 1/2 hours, never uneventful, something to live through.

Discussion among school staff...(A, 19) Among the 19 completions, five used terms such as: frequent and helpful, good, very cooperative, friendly and realistic. Eight stated that it centered on problems rather than solutions, centered on extreme cases, centered on authoritarian discipline vs. giving students responsibility, etc. Two responses stressed faculty division on policies or issues. Other completions used terms such as stupid, cliquish, considerable discontent, should be normal and often.

The greatest hope for this school...(B, 22) The completions to this stem were not easily classified. Four focused on student results such as: getting students to think about their future, to find and set goals, to produce capable leaders and good citizens. Four focused on having a good staff of teachers and administrators who would stay and provide a learning climate. Three hoped for smaller classes or other means to individualize instruction. Integration, breaking barriers that prevent understanding, getting teachers to work as a team, all respecting each other and having a climate for learning were themes in five sentences. Greater parental and community involvement was mentioned twice. Other content included: is an admission that there are problems and solutions to them, actually believing student can learn, to lose a reputation as a snob school, to get rid to the portables, and for a change in the finances of the school.

I get mad when...(A, 22) Among the 22 sentences, there were four outstanding themes: (a) inability to establish contact or loss of contact with students; (b) attitudes and prejudice shown by students or teachers; (c) apathy or inaction of the staff, and (d) interruptions in the classroom. Two responses asserted: I don't or haven't gotten mad most situations are understandable. There were four "contact" responses with complaints of losing cooperation of students, losing contact or can't get needed materials, inflexible teachers who aren't reaching students, and classes of such size that it is impossible. Four attitude or prejudice responses complained of teachers showing racial prejudice, teachers or students who do things harmful to others, speaking in condescending manner about black or Mexican students as "deprived," and lack of progress in the attitude of society. Three complaints of apathy or inaction complained of teachers who talked much and did nothing, faculty who reacted to problems by being "nice" and not doing anything, and staff who acted as though they were doing enough to improve the quality of learning. Miscellaneous completions included: when parents don't show interest in their children; outside forces close our schools; I'm mistreated; speakers talk down to or constantly criticize teachers.

Student protest...(B, 20) Twenty responses were evaluative: five indicated that protest retarded education, was asinine if it led to demands, was often misdirected, had been given too much publicity that encouraged showoffs; seven considered it essentially useful if not unrealistic or misinformed, using such terms as: is part of growing up, part of democracy, a form of respect for institutions they expect to change, usually valid, good if students are thinking and well directed. Six sentences indicated that it was not a real issue, was only a minor thing, although students may support protests elsewhere. In several cases it was observed that the children were too young to understand, but got cought up in the action. The remaining completions were "average" and backed up by some group in the community.

Appendix C

Observer Reports

To provide the Consortium with immediate feedback and an additional evaluation tool, four to seven trained staff members were sent each week to carefully observe and record discussions in randomly selected schools. The group agreed beforehand upon a general method for observation and on what kinds of information to record. They met between sessions to discuss observation techniques and compare notes.

As a means of evaluation, these reports were clearly a limited and rather subjective source. They indicated generally that the choice of problems and the content of the simulated episodes was quite sound. These findings further corroborated the conclusions drawn from the critical-incidents interviews and pre-series sampling survey data. But the reports' main value was that they provided considerable first-hand, detailed information which could be obtained in no other way. For instance, the observations provided the staff with a more specific grasp of the difficulties the leaders were having, the effect of inadequate facilities, and the strengths and shortcomings of the package as a whole. Only by seeing the sessions in action, for example, was it apparent that some leaders had either not looked at their discussion guides or had not given any thought to them prior to meetings.

The immediate results of these observations were:

1. A partial mid-series revision of leader materials. Based on the difficulties observed, the Discussion Leader Guides for Programs 4 and 5 were rewritten to provide more specific analyses of episodes and additional questions.

2. This feedback was used as a basis for the final training session in which the project staff discussed and tried to provide solutions for the perceived difficulties that the more inexperienced leaders were having in their discussion groups.

There were 28 observer reports in all: 4 for Program 1; 7 for Program 2; 6 for Program 3; 6 for Program 4; and 5 for Program 5. Of the sessions observed, the number of viewers at a school varied from 7 to 36, averaging 18. These viewing groups broke up into discussion groups, the number of discussants (in the groups observed) varying from 7 to 20, averaging 10.5.

It is safe to make certain general conclusions observed to be common to all discussion groups and shared by the clear majority of participants:

1. Planning and organization both at district and school level was inadequate.
    a. Notification was poor; many found out at the last minute; there was the widespread impression that most teachers did not know about the series.
    b. The district office was perceived by many as providing little or no leadership and demonstrating little or no interest.
    c. The same was perceived true of principals and their staff, who often chose leaders and viewing rooms at the last minute. Clerks, custodians, nurses, etc., did not see Program 1, although it was especially relevant for them.
    d. School meetings often were not well planned, e.g., there was consistent difficulty in dividing viewers into discussion groups (e.g., drama rehearsals) in them at the time of telecast. Viewers' guides and exercise sheets generally were not used.

e. Almost everyone complained of the time and suggested that, to avoid tardiness, fatigue, and resentment, such a series should be shown on the school's, not the teacher's time, i.e., a minimum day.

f. The vast majority complained again and again that "those who need such a program the most did not attend" and that participation should be mandatory.

2. Content: Opinions varied quite widely about the quality of the simulated episodes which were telecast. The treatments were judged "infantile" to "highly sophisticated," and the urgency of an episode varied according to the problems of a particular school. But it was clear from the discussions observed that the issues depicted were indeed significant and highly relevant, were realistic and common, that most of the teachers were stimulated by them, and that most felt the workshop to be of value.

The 28 observer reports have been roughly tabulated by program according to a few general categories (see Table 5 on page 81).

Tardiness was a consistent problem (23 out of 28 reports noted latecomers, the highest ratio being 16 out of 30 viewers). Similarly, 24 reports found the viewing conditions inadequate, reasons ranging from faulty TV sets to outside noise. Half the discussion leaders observed were judged to be adequate: that is, they were able to get their members to participate, opened up specific issues, sustained them, redirected theoretical or irrelevant trends back to the subject, and tried to get participants to suggest solutions or action. The reports indicated (not necessarily reflected in table) that the most effective discussions had good leaders and the least effective had inadequate leaders. From the standpoint of the Program's objectives, 17 of the discussions were felt to be generally successful or effective. Of the 11 judged to be too general, superficial or theoretical, aggressively dominated by 2 or 3 members, inhibited by a principal, thwarted by rancor, and so on, many were judged to have the minimal value of allowing people to share views and be exposed to human relations problems. The vast majority of the reports indicated that all the programs were at least provocative.

In terms of the five programs, examination of tallies in Table 5 clearly indicated that Program 2 was markedly poorer than the other four. Nearly half of all the discussions judged unsuccessful or ineffective (5 out of 11) were following this program. The incidence of general, vague or hypothetical discussions was nearly twice the average for the other four, and the incidence of discussions where no suggestions or solutions were offered was twice the average for the other programs when allowance was made for the number of observations for each program. With such small samples these data would be only suggestive were it not for other evaluation information, including the end-of-session critique forms and post-series questionnaires, which corroborated the observers' reports. If the data on Program 2 were removed, the discussion quality judgments then showed 15 successful compared with 6 unsuccessful (71%) as compared to 17 and 11 (61%) if all five programs were considered. Program 2 obviously must be deleted or revised.

Table 5

Observer Reports

	Program **					
	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Number of observation reports	4	7	6	6	5	28
CONDITIONS						
Tardiness	4	7	4	4	4	23
Viewing conditions inadequate	4	7	5	4	4	24
DISCUSSION LEADER						
Good or adequate	2	3	4	3	2	14
Inadequate	2	4	2	3	3	14
DISCUSSION QUALITY						
Generally successful or effective	3	2	5	4	3	17
Generally unsuccessful or ineffective	1	5	1	2	2	11
SPECIFIC DISCUSSION CHARACTERISTICS*						
Specific issues discussed	1	0	4	4	1	10
Solutions suggested or action planned	2	0	3	4	3	12
Superficial; avoided issues	1	3	1	2	2	9
General, vague, or hypothetical	3	5	2	2	2	14
No suggestions or solutions offered	2	6	2	2	3	15

** Program Content

1. Schools and the Minorities
2. Curriculum
3. Language
4. Rules and Regulations
5. Confrontations

*These categories are not mutually exclusive and responses are multiply coded; observers often listed two or more specific characteristics of one discussion. For example, although only six observers evaluated the discussions following Program 4, eight specific positive and six specific negative characteristics were listed in the observation reports.

Appendix D

Program Critique Forms

At the end of each session, participants were asked to complete a one-page critique form which contained four incomplete sentences and four rating scales. Data on the rating scales are presented in the text on pages 32 - 35. The observer reports indicated that these sheets were often filled in rapidly. This fact should be taken into account when considering the results, especially for thefollowing sentence-completion information. In nearly every case the evaluations were immediate, first impressions of what had just occurred.

Program 1: The School Through the Eyes of its Clients

The most significant thing that occurred in this session was... Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the completions to this sentence indicated some specific aspect of the discussion, such as "discussion of the role of parents in the school," "that there were differences of opinion among the faculty," "that it stirred up lively discussion and interest in this problem;" or "the discussion following the program; the group wishes to initiate changes in the school." Almost a fourth reacted to some aspect of the telecast; 14% responded to the filmed school incidents--"incident with Spanish-speaking lady," "the way parents are received at school," "a depiction of unsatisfactory ways for office personnel to meet the public," and 10% responded to the filmed interviews with parents--"some parents are unhappy with the schools," "implications that the public has a poor image of the schools." Another fourth of the responses indicated that something had been learned ("an awareness that there are problems") or made general, positive remarks about the discussion. Fewer than 3% of 271 classifiable responses were clearly negative, with two specific criticisms of the discussion, one negative response to the film, and four other negative responses.

In terms of its (Program 1) value for me I would say that... Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the sentence completions indicated that something was learned about the parents' or community's point of view as far as their treatment by school personnel is concerned, or they indicated that they were more aware of their own faults with regard to the problem areas depicted in the telecast. Another 36% made comments indicating that the program had been generally valuable in some other way. Conversely, 14% stated that the program had not been valuable; the responses were quite diverse and not easily codable into specific categories. Another 12% made unclassifiable or ambiguous responses which were neither clearly positive nor negative in content.

Regarding the television broadcast, I believe... Slightly over half of the completions to this stem were clearly positive; of these, 23% indicated that the telecast was generally good, well done or enjoyable; 17% of the completions indicated that it was valuable, useful, beneficial or thought-provoking; 10% indicated that it was believable, realistic, "actually happens" or was relevant to their school; and 3% believed the film should be seen by others. Eleven percent (11%) made specific suggestions on how the telecast could be improved either by changing or adding something to content or by improving the sound or focus. Twenty-six percent (26%) of the responses were clearly negative, 9% responded to specific program content, 9% to the poor technical quality of the filmed portions, 4% considered the treatment as depressing or too negative in approach and 4% more complained that the treatment was not valid, too one-sided, or biased. Another 10% of the responses were either non-evaluation responses concerning content or ambiguous, unclassifiable comments.

The biggest improvement that could be made in this session would be to... Forty-five percent (45%) of the completions focused on the discussion groups either in terms of composition or content; of these, 18% suggested changes such as "use smaller groups," or "get people in group better organized"; another 18% suggested that more staff should be involved, e.g., "make it mandatory," "more teachers should participate" or "community should be invited"; and 9% suggested making improvements in the discussion content. Thirty-one percent (31%) suggested changes in telecast content or viewing conditions; of these, 6% wanted a more realistic portrayal of situations, 1% wanted some balance in showing positive aspects as well as negative, 3% called for solutions to be shown as well as problems, 9% wanted other content changes or additions and 12% called for improvement in the sound (whether in the film sound tract, receiver or viewing room). (Portions of the sound on the film were poor.) Six percent (6%) of the suggestions were for miscellaneous improvements, too diverse to be codable. Seven percent (7%) made responses to the effect that no changes were needed in the telecast, that it was "right" as is.

Program 2: Curriculum and Instructional Practice

The most significant thing... One third responded to the telecast content; of these comments, 31% were essentially in the desired direction, e.g., "that the students felt that the teacher had nothing in common with them," or "the point of curriculum not always being relevant to student needs." In the process of coding responses to this stem, it was noted that most individuals seemed to feel that the filmed student discussion was the most significant occurrence of the session. A further analysis of these responses showed that over half dealt with reactions to student opinions, the student discussion, or the value of hearing what students have to say; almost another fourth dealt with the problems of teacher-student communication or poor relationships between some teachers and some students.

The next largest category (28%) related to some aspect of the discussion; of these, 23% dealt with content, such as, "discussion of tracking," "discussion of how to make things relevant," or "drew up proposal to be sent to principal on role of reading specialist," and 5% dealt with socio-emotional aspects of the discussion rather than content, e.g., "the moments when someone spoke (about anything) with passion," or "some sharing of experience and some communication among teachers."

Twenty-one percent (21%) made other positive responses; 9% of these indicated that either the discussion session or the telecast or both had created new awareness or understanding--"became more aware of students," "I discovered many [name of school] teachers feel they don't need help," "that our values are quite different from the students' values"; 8% indicated that something good or valuable happened, "a sharpening of focus on the need for greater self-examination with regard to the curriculum," "awareness of lack of 'communication' between students and teachers," "exposure to the worst in present teaching procedures" or "pointing out the need for a personal relationship with students"; another 4% were positive but don't fall into any specific category.

Twelve percent (12%) were neutral statements about the discussion or unclassifiable. Seven percent (7%) were negative; of these, 2% made specific negative remarks about the telecast and 2% were specifically negative about the discussion.

In terms of its value for me... Just slightly over half (51%) responded that this session had been of value to them. Most of these indicated that they had learned something specifically from the telecast content, e.g., "I have become more aware of the need for a more flexible curriculum." A fourth (25%) stated that this session had no value for them in any way. Fifteen percent (15%) gave responses which contained mixed evaluation, involving both good and bad elements. The remaining responses were unclassifiable or ambiguous.

Regarding the television broadcast... Forty-eight percent (48%) of the responses were positive; of these, 29% indicated that the broadcast was well done or generally good; 10% considered it valuable, useful, beneficial, or thought provoking; and 4% indicated that it was realistic, believable, or relevant to their school. Eleven percent (11%) of the statements either described program content in non-evaluative terms or were neutral. Twelve percent (12%) indicated the program was adequate but suggested specific changes or additions to improve the presentation. An impressive 29%, the largest for any program, were negative; of these, 7% criticized the sound or film quality, 6% criticized content, 6% gave other negative comments not dealing specifically with technical quality or content, 6% charged the treatment was not valid, too one sided or biased, 2% stated that the treatment was over-exaggerated or too obvious, and 2% said that it was too negative and depressing. These findings corroborated the observers' reports for this program.

The biggest improvement that could be made in this session would be to... Forty percent (40%) of the responses suggested some change or addition in film content; 7% of these dealt with technical quality; 4% of these indicated that the treatment was unrealistic or too obvious and should be corrected to make the treatment closer to reality for secondary schools; 5% asked that positive instances be shown; and another 4% suggested more solutions be given. Twenty percent (20%) of the completions suggested that others be included in the discussion group--"make it mandatory, invite students, parents, etc." Suggestions for improving the discussion were made by 24%; of these, 15% made comments on content such as "steer discussions so time will not be wasted on limited personal experiences." Four per cent (4%) suggested other miscellaneous improvements, 3% said no change was needed, and 10% were ambiguous and unclassifiable.

Program 3: Hidden Language

The most significant thing was... The most frequent category (30%) dealt with specific positive aspects of the discussion: "during the discussion when Negro teachers expressed their views on the usage of words," "that a person should examine the feeling in herself which causes her to make similar though less blatant denigrating comments," or "our group admitting to same or similar verbal usages." One fourth (25%) commented positively on the content of the telecast: "pointing out the errors of language used by teachers," "the fact that teachers can use language that so often offends students," or "illustrations of how prejudices may build barriers to communication." Thirteen percent (13%) made comments indicating that they had greater awareness: "an awareness of the effect of language and hidden meanings," "being made aware of the wrong use of language," or "I came to realize that we can't really use effectively collective terms such as 'you people' without creating hostility; we always have to address people as individuals." Eight percent (8%)

were socio-emotional responses to the discussion, another 8% were neutral statements about the discussion, and 3% were miscellaneous positive responses. Eight percent (8%) were ambiguous or unclassifiable. Five percent (5%) were clearly negative, with 2% of these directed to telecast program content.

In terms of its value for me... Nearly two-thirds (64%) of the responses were positive; 21% indicated some particular value or use; 16% stated that they had learned something; and 27% gave miscellaneous positive responses. Eight percent (8%) stated that the session was of no value for them, and 28% gave ambiguous or unclassifiable answers.

Regarding the television broadcast... Slightly over half (54%) of the responses were positive; of these, 10% specifically indicated that the broadcast was believable or realistic and 9% commented specifically on its use or value. Nine percent (9%) responded that the treatment was adequate or fair but made suggestions for improvements. Ten percent (10%) made either neutral, ambiguous, or unclassifiable responses. Twenty-seven percent (27%) made negative comments; 15% of these stated the treatment was over-exaggerated or too obvious; 7% complained of technical quality; 3% made negative comments about content, and 2% considered the treatment too negative or depressing, or biased.

The biggest improvement that could be made in this session would be... Forty percent (40%) suggested some improvement in the broadcast; of these, 17% asked for solutions to problems; 9% wanted more realistic treatment; 1% wanted portrayal of positive incidents; 3% wanted other content changes; and 10% called for technical improvements in sound or picture. Discussion changes accounted for 38%; of these, 17% suggested content changes in the discussion, and 10% suggested structural changes such as size of group or length of discussion session. Eleven percent (11%) made another plea for including others in the discussion--make it mandatory. Ten percent (10%) felt that no improvement was needed for the session; 5% called for miscellaneous improvement, and 7% gave unclassifiable, neutral, or ambiguous responses.

Program 4: Confrontations Involving Rules and Regulations.

The most significant thing was... Forty-one percent (41%) of the responses dealt with positive comment regarding the discussion: "that our discussion encouraged participants to re-evaluate the rules and behavior codes of the school in the light of reality," "people got pretty involved over school rules," "discussion of our own school rules--are they up-dated?" Twenty-four percent (24%) reacted to specific telecast content, e.g. "the defiance that students can show," "teachers were made aware of the fact that rules should be flexible," or "the scuffling session about tripping." Fourteen percent (14%) indicated they had learned something: "my realization that my special problems are other teachers' problems too," "that there are many alternative ways to handle problems--without causing confrontations and scenes," or "realization that many school rules are unnecessary." Three percent (3%) listed role-playing which they did in their discussion group as the most significant event. Another four percent (4%) made miscellaneous positive remarks. Eight percent (8%) made neutral remarks about the discussion, and 2% were unclassifiable. Four percent (4%) of the responses were negative, with 2% referring specifically either to the telecast or the group discussion.

In terms of its value for me... Slightly over half (55%) said the program was of value, and most of these responses, as in the case of other sessions, indicated that the value lay in what it had pointed out in terms of specific content; in this case, the value lay in terms of what it had to say about rules and regulations. Eleven percent (11%) said this session was of no value, and 34% gave neutral, ambiguous, or otherwise unclassifiable responses.

Regarding the television broadcast... Two-thirds (68%) made positive comments; of these, 15% gave responses indicating that it was valuable, useful, or beneficial; 15% indicated that it was believable or realistic; and the remainder made a variety of positive comments, with 6% of these indicating that it was only adequate or fair. Seven percent (7%) suggested changes or additions. Thirteen percent (13%) of the responses were negative, with 12% criticizing content and 1% criticizing technical quality. Eleven percent (11%) were neutral or unclassifiable.

The biggest improvement would be... Nearly a third suggested some improvement in the discussion; 12% focused on content changes and 20% on structural changes. Almost the same number concentrated on broadcast changes; 26% recommended content changes (5% more realistic, 2% show positive aspects, 9% give solutions, and 10% other content changes), and 5% recommended technical quality improvements or other non-content changes. Seven percent (7%) were still calling for a larger or mandatory involvement on the part of school staff; 2% called for other improvements; 11% thought no improvement was necessary; and 17% of the responses were ambiguous or unclassifiable.

Program 5: Ethnic and Cultural Confrontations.

The most significant thing was... Again, the largest class of positive responses (33%) dealt with discussion content: "a serious discussion of attitudes toward ethnic groups," "participants' agreement that something must be done to update curriculum offerings to cover types of confrontations shown," "the discussion provoked by the presentation of the 'dirty dozens.'" Twenty-two percent (22%) reacted to telecast content: "the teacher that ignored a situation until it reached the point of an altercation between students" or "that it was again pointed out that many problems stem from teacher insensibility." Fourteen percent (14%) simply indicated that the discussion was significant without specific elaboration. Another 22.5% gave other positive responses; 8% of these focused on awareness, e.g., "a realization that after five sessions we have not even scratched the surface of effective communication," "that white teachers need to re-evaluate how they relate social material to black students," or "an awareness of how attitudes and closing or threatening feelings can alienate students;" 4% responded to the socio-emotional aspects of the discussion and 2% specifically mentioned role-playing. Only 3% of the responses were ambiguous or unclassifiable, while 5.5% were obviously negative, with 2% of these mentioning specific negative aspects of the telecast or the discussion.

In terms of its value for me... Seventy-three percent (73%) found the session valuable; however, unlike comments on previous sessions, the value statements were more general, for example: "It revealed social school problems," or "it increased my awareness," etc. Sixteen percent (16%) considered the session of no value, and 11% gave neutral or unclassifiable responses.

Regarding the television broadcast, I believe... Over half (58%) made positive comments; of these, 6% stated that it was the best of the five broadcasts; 11% thought it was a realistic treatment; 7% considered it valuable, useful or beneficial; the remaining 34% made a variety of positive comments. On the other hand, 13% considered the program adequate or fair, or called for some changes in content, and 22% of the responses were negative. Of these 22% negative responses, 4% were about technical qualities such as poor sound; 17% made negative comments on choice of content; 5% considered the treatment exaggerated or too obvious; 3% felt it was too depressing or too negative; and 2% made other general, negative comments. Seven percent (7%) of the responses were neutral or unclassifiable.

The biggest improvement that could be made in this session would be to... Forty-two percent (42%) of the suggestions dealt with the broadcast; 12% wanted solutions to problems shown; 5% wanted more realistic treatment; 1% wanted positive incidents to balance the negative; 17% suggested a variety of other content changes; and 7% dealt with technical qualities other than content. A fourth of the responses (26%) dealt with the discussion; 9% called for including others such as parents, students or the rest of the staff in the discussion; 8% called for structural changes in group size, organization, or procedures; 7% wanted changes in discussion content; and 2% wished to improve some aspect of role-playing. Three percent (3%) called for other improvements. A fifth of the responses (20%) believed that no changes or improvements were needed, and 9% gave neutral, ambiguous or otherwise unclassifiable responses.

Appendix E

Content Analysis of the End-of-Course Questionnaire

Sample

At the end of the fifth session, October 30, 1968, a four-page questionnaire with cover page was distributed to each course participant and discussion leader. At the time data analysis was begun, 285 had been completed and returned. The questionnaires were arranged by district, by school within district, and randomly by subject within school. Then 142 were selected for analysis by taking every other critique. The sample was of adequate size, but possibly biased since it is estimated that at least 737 persons attended some of the sessions and 414 may have attended all of the sessions. (These estimates are based on attendance records which are not entirely complete.) The responses of those who did not complete the critiques might have been less favorable.

Questionnaire Content

The following questions were asked:

1. What was the most memorable TV program? Why?
2. What do you remember most about the group sessions after the TV program? Why?
3. Has this course been of any help or use to you? Please explain.
4. Can you describe any specific things which you have done or changes which you have made in your classroom or in your school as a result of this course?
5. What are the two most important things that should be done if this course were repeated in this school district?

6. Specifically, how would you improve the telecasts?
7. How adequate was your discussion leader?
8. Is there any specific skill or training which would make the discussion leader more effective?
9. How often did you use the Viewer's Guide?
10. Did you find it of any value or use?
11. Do you have any specific suggestions for improving it?
12. How many exercise sheets did you complete?
13. If you completed any exercise sheets, which one(s) did you find most useful? Why?
14. Do you have any suggestions for improving the exercise sheets?
15. How much time should be allowed for discussion following the telecast?
16. Did your group do any role-playing?
17. If yes, what is your opinion of its use or value?
18. Overall, what is your assessment of this course?
19. Specifically, would you recommend this course for other school personnel? (And, if so, under what conditions or for whom?)
20. Would you recommend any new or additional subject matter, content, or kind of treatment which would be appropriate to this series? Please be specific in describing it.
21. Is there anything in the five existing television programs which you believe must be deleted because it is ineffective or offensive?

Space was provided on the form to briefly answer each of the above questions. The last page contained an incomplete-sentence blank, similar to the "A" and "B" forms used in the pre-series interviews, with eight items selected from the "A" and "B" forms, namely:

Form D

1. My job in this school
2. The relevance of what we teach
3. The neighborhood this school serves
4. School rules
5. Language and communication in the classroom
6. Racial tensions in this school
7. Student behavior
8. Discussion among the school staff

Form E

1. The faculty of this school
2. Discipline in this school
3. The curriculum
4. School regulations or procedures
5. When I talk to students
6. Courtesy and respect
7. Profanity in the classroom
8. Student protest

One of these two lists of items was attached on a random basis to the questionnaires. All of these items probed at specific program content.

Results

Most memorable program. Program 5 (ethnic confrontations) was selected with greatest frequency (35%), followed by Program 3 (hidden language) (22%), Program 4 (school rules and disciplinary confrontation) (17%), Program 1 (the school as it is encountered by minority parents) (16%) and, finally, Program 2 (student reaction to instructional content and practice) (11%). Slightly over a third (37%) gave specific responses regarding why the program was memorable.

Reasons given for Program 5 were that it was: the most relevant; depicted [ethnic confrontation] situations which really occur, which teachers have to face; because it was the most objective and relevant, etc.

Program 3 was memorable because of its application either to the person or to his school. Individuals remembered parts of the group discussion about communication and hidden language or were struck by the filmed episodes; two specifically singled out the episode involving the coach and the boy saying that it "bothered them."

Program 4 was memorable chiefly because of the meaningful discussions about school rules and students' complaints about them which followed the program; the respondents liked this program because it was relevant to them, timely, likely to happen, real, etc.

Program 1 was remembered because of its relevance either to front-office situations in their own school--"told it like it was"--or because of the relevance which they found for the reexamination of their own behavior *vis à vis* parents.

Program 2, the least frequently memorable, was liked chiefly because the students on the program spoke up so critically about the curriculum content and classroom instruction. Most were positive, finding the program applicable or interesting, but one respondent thought that the student who said teachers aren't "with it" was "wrong."

What Was Most Memorable About the Group Discussions

The opportunity for the exchange of ideas or feelings accounted for nearly half of the responses to the question, "What do you remember most about the group sessions after the TV Program? Why?" Twenty-three percent (23%) mentioned the exchange of ideas which made suggestions for solutions; that is, orientation was to content. Examples were "several of the ideas on how different teachers are diplomatic when forced to correct students on behavior,""the concern, problems and ideas of other teachers,""the exchange of so many marvelous ideas." On the other hand, 12% focused on the exchange of experiences, feelings, or the development of a sense of closeness or togetherness. Examples of these comments were, "they helped us hear and learn about the feelings and attitudes of other members of the faculty"; "the discussion after the first program left us all having a feeling of togetherness"; "the interaction between teachers--both black and white--discussing things frankly"; "little opportunity for this among teachers at [name of school]."

Among the remaining positive comments, 6% emphasized that they had learned or realized something, for instance, "the frank discussion among whites and blacks about how things are in the school...was to take a good hard look at ourselves"; "I remember the discussions at the group sessions which dealt with the reactions of black students to word connotations--I had not realized these things could be so volatile." Statements that the program was good or other positive comments of a general nature were made by another 5%, and 3% mentioned role-playing as being the most memorable experience.

Seven percent of the responses were essentially neutral. These comments were usually simple statements of what happened in the group such as, "we talked about...," or "we did...." In these statements, there was no evaluation made nor was any emotional content discernable.

Twenty-seven percent (27%) of the comments were essentially negative; of these, 13% complained of lack of reality or action, for instance, "mostly the general irritation with the lack of reality," "not too much; mainly because discussions held are for the most part common ones--talk but no action." Another 10% of the teachers refused, or complained of others refusing, to accept the validity of the program content, playing down the meaning or relevance of the materials for themselves; or indicating that the situation was not true in their schools. Examples of these comments are, "most discussions were very frustrating--not honest evaluations "; "we're really not that bad";"the defensiveness and hostility of many of the teachers was a real shock";"the unyielding attitude of many of the teachers who have been around for a long time." A closely related theme expressed by 3% was a feeling of frustration with respect to the fact that not enough teachers were present, that not enough solutions were developed, or that there was other frustration about the discussion developments. In addition, another 1% complained of an over-righteous faculty who found fault with everyone but itself.

Of the remaining responses, 13% were ambiguous or undecipherable and 4% were left blank.

Usefullness of the course. The 142 questionnaires yeilded 166 distinquishable statements of how the course had (or had not) been of use or help. Of these 166 statements, 83% were positive, 13% were negative, and 4% were ambiguous.

The largest number of positive responses (26%) involved expressed awareness or sensitivity to issues which (a) were specifically dealt with in the programs (15%) or (b) involved awareness of related issues (11%). Respondents who felt that the programs "drew attention to," "focused on," or "helped point out" problems and issues were included in this category. Examples of specific program content awareness responses were: yes, definitely; the episodes...gave enlightening insights into teachers generally; it [the course] has made me somewhat more aware that these situations exist; it pointed out things often taken for granted--language, etc.; I am more aware of offensive lines of conversation and hopefully have changed certain vocabulary items. Examples of the general awareness category were: yes, I believe the course pointed up certain areas of misunderstanding and also made me aware of some personal faults in dealing with students under certain circumstances; it has made me aware that problems exist; it has helped me become aware of some of the difficulties which exist in the classroom and how they could be avoided by different action on the part of the teacher.

The next most frequent category (17%) included responses indicating that the course had been of help because of something they gained from the discussions, such as the following examples: it was helpful as a means of drawing school personnel together for the primary purpose of considering human relations issues; the discussions opened many avenues dealing with potentially explosive situations; they showed how frank talk is more valuable than an embarrassed skirting of issues; valuable--good to talk about common problems; concrete conclusions resulted; yes, I think so--availability of other teachers and administrators talking about the problems raised in programs on classroom confrontations, rules, racial matters--great opportunity.

Following this category in proportion of responses (10%) were statements indicating that something had been learned. Examples were: I was able to gather new ideas for attacking classroom problems; this course... has shown me how to cope with [problems that occur in the classroom]; ...I learned some practical techniques for dealing with specific problems; it showed me how to cope with some problems I might have someday.

The next category, accounting for 10% of the responses, contained statements dealing with the socio-emotional or social-support aspects of the group discussion, or of the program in general. It includes such phrases as, has caused "better feeling," "better communication," "better understanding," "closer relationships," "more warmth" among faculty members. Specific examples were: it has helped me better understand and tolerate the opinions of my colleagues; it has helped me to see that my problems are not unique; it has helped me know our faculty better...; it has helped communication between faculty members.

The remainder of the positive statements were almost evenly divided among three categories: (a) that the programs explained or increased the respondents' understanding of issues or problems, (b) that the sessions stimulated thinking, problem analysis, evaluation of courses of action and their possible consequences, etc., and (c) that participation had caused the person to make, or plan to make, changes in behavior.

Among the 13% of the negative statements, 4% were concerned with the fact that the programs had provided no solutions or answers to the problems posed (and apparently no or inadequate solutions were developed in the discussion sessions); 3% admitted the existence of the problems but expressed a sense of futility, frustration or powerlessness with respect to dealing with them; 2% of the statements indicated that they learned nothing new; 1% rejected the validity or relevance of the situations presented on the programs, either the conditions did not exist in their school or they were not presented realistically (overexaggerated?); and 3% simply said the course was of no help without explanation.

Of the 4% classified as ambiguous, 3% used statements such as "yes" and "no" or made remarks that mixed general praise and criticism to such an extent that they could not be assigned to positive or negative categories mentioned above; the remaining 1% (actually one response) was unclassifiable.

Specific Changes Made as a Result of the Course. Perhaps the most important question on the questionnaire, and certainly the most encouraging in terms of response, was the following: Can you describe any specific things which you have done or changes which have been made in your classroom as a result of this course?

Surprisingly, 109 out of 142 respondents (77%) listed positive changes, and the overall total of changes listed (since some individuals listed more than one change) was 205.

The easiest way of coding these changes, which also seemed the most meaningful, was to divide them as follows:

Personal Changes	
Very positive changes; changes with strong "action component	6%
Positive changes; changes with moderate action or intended action	16%
Vaguely positive; no action or only vague intentions; very general	14%
Classroom Changes	
Very positive changes; strong action	10%
Positive changes; moderate or intended action	10%
Vaguely positive; no action, vague intentions	7%
School Changes	
Very positive changes; strong action	11%
Positive changes; moderate or intended action	9%
Vaguely positive; no action, vague intentions	13%

There were eight ambiguous answers (4%), and one individual said that he had made changes in his classroom with disastrous results.

Examples of responses in each of the above categories are given below:

Personal

1. Taken active part in minimum-day programs.
   Volunteered for Human Relations Committee at school.
   I have stopped referring to students as "you people."
2. My rules and regulations have become more flexible.
   Using word "black" instead of "Negro."
   Try to see student viewpoint.

I have a more tuned ear to what students say to each other and what I say.

3. Think a bit more carefully before jabbing fun at students.

   A little more understanding; a little more patience.

   I question my actions more critically.

Classroom

1. I have been using role-playing in the classroom.

   Discussed problems of communication between generations, teachers and students, etc., with students--this helped all of us.

   Allotting 10 minutes three times a week for class discussion on student problems.

   Tried to use more material of current interest in curriculum.

   I am attempting to bring understanding by having discussion on race problems.

2. Ways to handle situations more effectively: sunglasses in class, name calling and many more.

   Became more honest and open with the students concerning certain problems, such as race relations.

   Refused to cause a scene over gum and "shades" in the classroom while still discouraging these practices in class.

   Exploring ways to make curriculum more related to real life situations.

3. Attempt to fulfill student needs by more individual help in classwork, though in large classes with limited equipment, this is quite difficult to accomplish.

   I try not to really insist that they bring all their supplies to class.

School

1. Student receptionists to meet visitors to school.

   A thorough re-evaluation of rules by faculty with recommendations by students.

   Resolution made to begin teacher-training in Black History.

2. A follow-up session will be held by faculty to discuss the ideas that have come out of the program, allow for teacher reactions.

   We may revise some of our rules.

   A rules committee was formed to revise out-dated rules.

3. Teachers are becoming more aware of their responsibilities.

   There is an attempt to be helpful to visitors.

   A few of the really interested teachers are using more understanding in dealing with alienated students.

Recommendations for Course Improvement

There were 223 responses to the question, "What are the two most important things that should be done if this course were to be repeated in this school district?" Slightly less than half (47%) of the suggestions dealt with course content or media; of these, 12% dealt with changing some technical aspect, such as improving the sound, size of video screens, and so forth; 8% called for providing solutions or specific techniques for dealing with human relations problems; 8% felt that it would be an improvement if the television programs had a less negative or biased approach, and stated that constructive, positive situations should be shown rather than showing teachers in the wrong all the time; a related 5% called for more realistic treatments, usually implying that the enacted situations were more extreme or had gotten more out of hand than would normally happen; the remaining 14% of these suggestions about content were directed to a variety of other specific or general suggestions for changes or additions in the television program content.

The second largest group of suggestions (36%) dealt with structural or organizational improvements; of these, 27% fell into the category dealing with increasing attendance or enlarging the number or kind of people invited or required to attend the course. This involved such responses as: make it mandatory; involve administrative personnel; arrange for students and/or public to attend. The remaining 9% called for changes to make it easier for teachers to attend sessions, such as better publicity giving times and places and changing the time of the sessions so that they are more convenient for teachers to attend.

The remainder of the suggestions (17%) were too miscellaneous to permit convenient summarization.

Leader Adequacy and Training Suggestions

Participants were asked, "How adequate was your discussion leader?" The descriptive terms, grouped by category with percentages, were as follows:

Excellent, very good, quite adequate, outstanding, great	46%
Good, satisfactory, adequate, OK, capable	24%
Fair, average, adequate, but...(some failure)	9%
Not so good, poor, or very poor	8%
I was the leader	9%
No or ambiguous answer	4%

If the leaders and no answer and ambiguous responses were removed, 81% of those making an evaluation considered their leaders to be adequate or better, and over half (53%) judged their leader to be very good, excellent, or outstanding.

Participants were also asked, is there any specific training which would make the discussion leader more effective? With such a high appraisal of most of their leaders it may not be surprising that nearly half (46%) felt that no training was required, and in fact 9% specifically remarked that their leaders were already well trained. On the other hand, 36% mentioned the need for further training, with discussion leader training first, greater preparation in the problem content areas second, and role-playing training third in the frequency of mentioned suggestions. Ten percent (10%) suggested that personality or interest were major factors, implying that leader selection was more important than training. Four percent (4%) asserted that group factors dominated, e.g., in a good group you don't need much of a leader.

Use and Value of the Viewer's Guide. The alternative and percentages marking these two questions are as follows:

How often did you use the *Viewer's Guide*?		Did you find it of any use?	
Never	10%	No value	6%
Seldom	20%	Little value	18%
Sometimes	21%	Some value	46%
Usually	24%	Much value	23%
Always	23%		
No answer	2%	No answer	6%

Specific suggestions for improving the *Viewer's Guide* were made by less than a fourth of the teachers; nearly a fourth of those making comments were critical, suggesting that it was not necessary, uninteresting, too wordy or "busywork." The most telling comment of this type was, "It wasn't a guide, it was just a piece of paper to aid people without memories." Another fourth were favorable, but not very helpful, e.g., "well done, adequate, useful." Among the remaining suggestions, the following may be of some value:

> Why not suggest that the users write their feelings about each skit instead of notes and then try exploring why they felt that way.
>
> Provide more detail, give guidance on things to look for (16% of the suggestions dealt with the need for more detail).
>
> Provide a short review after the comments section.
>
> Provide a synopsis of the program.
>
> Distribute it early enough to study.
>
> Include questions or suggestions to start discussion.
>
> Include suggestions for action.
>
> Use some T-F questions to stimulate interest.
>
> Include an explanation of what the course is about.

Exercise Sheets. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that they made little or no use of these exercise sheets. Among those who reported using them, it is clear that many were confusing these with the *Viewer's Guide*. This was mainly a failure in design of the question and its placement. For those who seemed to be reacting to the sheets, reaction was quite mixed; well over half considered them ineffective, boring, not useful, too general or complained that they didn't have time to do the assignments. For those who saw some value in them, some suggested that they could be better used after rather than before the sessions; others called for more specific instructions.

Recommended Time for Discussion. In response to the question, "How much time should be allowed for discussion following the telecast?" just over half (55%) of those responding to this question indicated that one hour would be the best choice; another 24% felt that one and one-half hours was the appropriate time; 9% chose two hours; 4% wanted more than two hours, and 8% wanted one-half hour.

Role-Playing. Fifty-two percent (52%) indicated that they had role-played during their discussion session; 44% indicated that they had not, and 4% did not answer the question.

Of those reporting that they had role-played, favorable comments were made by 70%. Many of them stated that the role-playing was extremely valuable, very good, outstanding, great, or very practical; two stated that it was the best part of the entire course, and another stated that they got more problem-solving done then than at any other time. Other comments were that it was valuable to provide illustration, to become detached from the actual confrontation and work with the staff, and to see and feel the actual confrontation, to stimulate discussion and so on. Negative comments indicated that although it might be interesting, they considered it of doubtful use, little value, or a waste of time; one person complained that they got hung up on acting; and another indicated that they needed more help to do it correctly. One suggestion was that role-playing should be introduced with Program 3, because by Program 4 they were too comfortable with a discussion-only style to really want to try it. Two more persons indicated that they thought that role-playing would be valuable if there were a good leader (with the implication that role-playing was not very good without a good leader).

Assessment of the Course. In response to the question, "Overall, what is your assessment of this course?" all but 4% provided some statement of their assessment. Although the answers were quite diverse, they may, with some oversimplification, be classified in the following tabular form:

Excellent, much or great value	17%
Very valuable, v. helpful, v. good or v. beneficial	20%
Valuable, good, beneficial	30%
Fair, adequate, satisfactory	12%
Poor, very poor, worthless	8%
No answer	4%
Miscellaneous responses, not classifiable above	9%

Under the miscellaneous category, two-thirds of the comments were mainly positive to the effect that the course was interesting, thought provoking, promoted better understanding of the feelings of others, or well organized. The remainder were essentially negative: one complained that the discussions had polarized the faculty and that there was no plan for reconciliation; another complained that the discussions touched upon, but did not come to grips with, so many problems; another noted that as an experiment the course needed further definition and more specific goals; another remarked that he had anxiety attacks over the discussion, but felt that the course was personally rewarding to him.

A second question dealing with the course assessment asked, "Specifically, would you recommend this course for other school personnel (and, if so, under what conditions or for whom)?" Ninety-two percent (92%) indicated that they would recommend the course to others, 4% indicated that they would not, 2% gave ambiguous answers and 2% did not answer the question. Of those who said that they would recommend the course, nearly all made specific recommendations for types of school personnel. Over two-thirds of those who made recommendations indicated that the program should be seen by,or was suitable for, all school personnel: 8% of those answering yes recommended that all teachers should see it; 9% singled out administrators; 6% indicated that it should also be seen by elementary school personnel; 6% singled out clerical staff as needing to see it; 6% considered it especially useful for new teachers (and one felt that it should be mandatory for teachers who had taught more than six years); 4% singled out counselors; 4% specifically mentioned parents and 4% students; 3% recommended it for school boards; other recommended groups included custodial workers, cafeteria workers, etc. In nearly all the above cases, the intent or tone of the recommendations was that these groups would find a special value in the program. On the other hand, some thought the course should be limited: 4% suggested that it should be shown to all personnel in "target" schools only, and another 4% suggested that all school personnel should see Program 1 but made remarks to the effect that the remaining four programs were primarily directed at classroom teachers and other instructional staff.

With respect to conditions, 5% suggested that the course be taught on a minimum-day schedule; 4% indicated that it should be voluntary and an equal number indicated that the course should be mandatory; 3% thought that the course should be repeated for any group; 3% believed that the course should be taken by teachers but only if it were "beefed-up"; one person suggested that the course be made into a "crash" course to be used before the start of school, and another person suggested that there be a shorter time between the viewing sessions.

In response to the question, "Would you recommend any new or additional subject matter, content, or kind of treatment which would be appropriate to this series? Please be as specific as you can in describing it," 76% made one or more suggestions in terms of what they would add. The list of suggestions was so diverse that it almost defied classification, with a few notable exceptions. Approximately a fifth, in one way or another, said that the program was too negative or "black oriented." They recommended that the positive aspects of education be shown, that examples of good teaching be presented, that black "heavies" as well as white "heavies" be shown as teachers, or that good examples of human relations should be depicted in addition to the poor examples. In many of these comments, there was a complaint about bias or a plea for balance in order that the program might be more acceptable or credible. Other frequent suggestions were concerned with providing solutions, preferably several solutions, to the problems presented, and obtaining more student participation, both in terms of developing longer episodes involving students and by using student panels to describe student views of school. Two or more persons suggested that: the programs deal with other minority groups to a larger extent, show relations between teachers and teachers, show confrontations between teachers and parents, deal with specialized instructional situations such as physical education or shop, and provide for some kind of a follow-up device.

Just over two-thirds (68%) answered "no" to the question, "Is there anything in the five existing television programs which you believe must be deleted because it is ineffective or offensive?" Six percent did not answer this question; the remaining 26% made some specific comment, although approximately half of these comments were suggestions for modifications rather than deletions. Again the recommendations were quite diverse. By far the most frequent response was again the comment that the programs must achieve a better balance between good and poor examples or must soften a harsh or biased treatment. One notable negative comment was, "Delete all--the programs emphasize that the problems of equality must be solved by whites, the programs should emphasize that the minority groups must share for present racial tension."

Negative comments regarding Program 1 rejected the situation with the Spanish-speaking lady with the comment that office personnel can't speak all languages; another comment was that this program was not useful for school personnel because it dealt mainly with office personnel. Complaints regarding Program 2 were that the student discussions were not effective and in some parts were unintelligible and that, in his lecture, the narrator used educational jargon as a "screen." Two persons commented that they found Program 3 generally dull. Another indicated that the review of the four previous programs in Program 5 was not too effective.

Other pertinent comments were that "four programs would be enough," "didn't feel the teacher panels helped much," and "I question showing this to the public and to the students, but perhaps they should know that we question our procedures."

The above comments were primarily made in terms of suggesting some modification or deletion to improve quality. Major themes throughout were that better balance must be achieved, that positive examples must be shown, and that solutions must be shown. Many teachers became defensive or indignant at seeing whites constantly case in unfavorable situations or they were critical of "exaggerated" TV images which they rejected as being extreme or unbelievable.

On the other hand, several teachers wrote at length to the effect that offensive material should not be deleted, for example:

> "Some material hurt, but it was true, although some teachers deny it as untrue."
>
> "Not one thing should be deleted. Too long have we been running

away from the truth; from the real facts and situations."

"No, what the hell, that's the trouble with most educational courses today. They are taught by people that have nothing to do with and no experience at the rougher school level."

"Thought it was all pertinent to the course structure, and to delete any part of it would be to take away from the whole."

Partial Bibliography

Adult Education Association of the U. S. A. *How to use role playing and other tools for learning* (Leadership Pamphlet No. 6). Chicago: AEA, 1955.

Benne, K. & Muntyan, B. What is role playing?; The uses of role playing. In *Human relations in curriculum change*. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.Pp.223-249.

Boniface, J. Role playing in kindergarten. *Grade Teacher*, 1958, *76* (10), 31.

Boyd, G. A. Role playing. *Social Education*, 1957, *21* (10), 267-269.

Boyd, G. A. & Youssi, M. R. Role-playing reveals language levels. *Elementary English*, 1957, *34* (10), 388-393.

Chesler, M. & Fox, R. *Role-playing methods in the classroom*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1966.

Dodson, M. C. The effects of problem-story role playing of fifth-grade children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1952.

Graham, G. Sociodrama as a teaching technique. *Social Studies*, 1960, *51* (12), 257-259.

Guetzkow, H. (Ed.) *Simulation in social sciences: readings*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Hendry, C. E., Lippitt, R., & Zander, A. Reality practice as educational method. *Psychodrama Monograph #9*. New York: Beacon Press, 1947.

Janis, I. L. & King, B. T. The influence of role playing on opinion change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1954, *49*, 211-218.

King, B. T. & Janis, I. L. Comparison of the effectiveness of improvised versus non-improvised role-playing in producing opinion changes. *Human Relations* 1956, *9*, 177-186.

Klein, A. F. *How to use role playing effectively*. New York: Association Press, 1959.

Klein, A. F. *Role playing in leadership training and group problem solving*. New York: Association Press, 1956.

Lange, C. J., Rittenhouse, C. H. & Atkinson, R. C. Films and group discussions as a means of training leaders. Technical Report No. 27, March, 1956, Human Resources Research Office.

Lohman, J. *Cultural patterns of differentiated youth: a manual for teachers in marginal schools*. Berkeley, California: School of Criminology, University of California.

McCarthy, W. Comparison and discussion in role-playing as techniques for influencing children's thinking about social values. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1959.

Maier, N. R. F. Role playing; Role playing in large groups. *Principles of human relations: applications to management*. New York: Wiley, 1952. Pp. 87-172.

Moreno, J. L. In *The Sociometry Reader*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960. Pp. 80-86.

Nichols, H. & Williams, L. *Learning about role-playing for children and teachers*. Washington, D. C.: Association for Childhood Educational International, 1960.

Shaftel, F. R. Learning to tell with others. *Childhood Education*, 1950, *27* (12), 161-165.

Shaftel, F. R. Role playing in teaching American ideals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1948.

Shaftel, F. R. & Shaftel, G. *Role playing for social values: decision-making in the social studies*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Shaftel, F. R. & Shaftel, G. *Role playing the problem story*. New York: National Council of Christians & Jews, 1952.

Shaftel, F. R. & Shaftel, G. *Words and action*. (Photo pictures for role-playing with young children.) New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1967.

Shellhammer, L. B. Solving personal problems through sociodrama. *English Journal*, 1949, *28* (11) 503-505.

Sobel, M. J. Sociodrama in the classroom. *Social Education*, 1952, *16* (4), 166-168.

Stufflebeam, D. L. *Evaluation as enlightenment for decision-making*. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Evaluation Center, 1968.

Webster, S. W. *Discipline in the classroom*. San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Co., 1968.